

an application filed for a patent on a parachute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1496. By the SPEAKER: Petition of K. P. Koenig and others, Denver, Colo., requesting Congress to amend the Railroad Retirement Act so as to provide needed pension benefits to railroad workers and their families; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1497. Also, petition of Interstate Compact Commissioner, Austin, Tex., relative to resolutions passed at a convention at Bismarck, N. Dak., August 24, 1949, in reference to the proper planning in the development and use of our land and water resources; to the Committee on Public Works.

1498. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Silver Spring, Md., relative to a grievance of Francis Jean Reuter against the Air Corps in reference to a notice of separation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1949

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 3, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, from the flickering torches of our own understanding, we would lift the difficult decisions of the public service into Thy holy light. Grant us inner greatness of spirit and clearness of vision to meet and match the large designs of this dangerous yet challenging day, that we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy truth which is marching on to a brighter tomorrow when Thy kingdom shall come and Thy will be done in all the earth. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 22, 1949, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it had been my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum, but if it is agreeable, I will ask unanimous consent that Senators may have leave to insert matters in the RECORD, because some have to catch trains.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that if a quorum is to be called, it might be better to have it called now, so that Senators who have any routine business to submit may be present.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Holland	Miller
Bricker	Humphrey	Millikin
Byrd	Ives	Murray
Cain	Jenner	Neely
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Cordon	Kem	Robertson
Donnell	Kerr	Russell
Douglas	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Downey	Knowland	Schoeppel
Eaton	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Leahy	Sparkman
Ferguson	Long	Stennis
Flanders	Lucas	Taft
Frear	McCarthy	Taylor
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
George	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McKellar	Tobey
Graham	McMahon	Vandenberg
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Martin	Williams
Hill	Maybank	Withers

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business with leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], I request that he be excused from the session of the Senate today, and from the sessions of the Senate during next week.

On behalf of myself I ask that I be excused from the session of the Senate next Monday, September 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

Mr. HILL asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on Monday next.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GRAHAM was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the next few days.

### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. O'CONOR, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that routine matters may be presented for the RECORD, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

#### AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### COST OF DAMAGES CAUSED BY MILITARY FORCES AT CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by United States military forces at Los Angeles Municipal Airport, Los Angeles, Calif., the Porterville (Calif.), Municipal Airport, and the Alice (Tex.), Municipal Airport (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

#### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the American Legion at its thirty-first annual national convention, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a strong and adequate merchant marine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors, National Paper Box Manufacturers Association, Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5598. A bill to increase compensation for World War I presumptive service-connected cases, provide minimum ratings for

service-connected arrested tuberculosis, increase certain disability and death compensation rates, liberalize requirement for dependency allowances, and redefine the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1103).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 250. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1105).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2560. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1106).

#### CONVERSION OF NATIONAL BANKS— REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 1161) to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1104) thereon.

I referred to this bill on the Senate floor yesterday. I learned this morning that the report to which I addressed my remarks was inadvertently mislaid and did not reach the desk. This bill was ordered reported by the committee by a vote of 7 to 3.

I repeat my request of yesterday that the report not be printed until such time as minority views have been filed in the Senate, and that the minority views, when submitted, which is expected to be before next Wednesday, be printed along with the report filed by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the request of the Senator from South Carolina to withhold printing of the report is granted.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2592. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Dimitri Athanas Hacudi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 2593. A bill to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 2594, to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 2595. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights in the government of the District of Columbia;

to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 2596, relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCLELLAN introduced Senate Joint Resolution 131, to require the transmission to the Congress of a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1951, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2594) to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color, introduced by Mr. TAFT, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice Act."

#### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(a) That the denying of employment opportunities to, and discrimination in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of race, creed, or color is contrary to the principles of freedom and equality of opportunity upon which this Nation is built, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

(b) That it is the policy of the United States to bring about the elimination of discrimination because of race, creed, or color in employment relations.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, and one for a term of 5 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 5 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Com-

mission and three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$12,000 a year, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(e) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

(f) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint such officers and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions;

(2) to cooperate with or utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to utilize voluntary and uncompensated services;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents or agencies the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) from time to time to make, amend, and rescind, in such manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

(5) to serve process or other papers of the Commission, either personally, by registered mail, or by leaving a copy at the principal office or place of business of the person to be served; and

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested Government and nongovernmental agencies.

#### DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to bring about the removal of discrimination in regard to hire, or tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or union membership, because of race, creed, or color—

(1) by making comprehensive studies of such discrimination in different metropolitan districts and sections of the country and of the effect of such discrimination, and of the best methods of eliminating it;

(2) by formulating, in cooperation with other interested public and private agencies, comprehensive plans for the elimination of such discrimination, as rapidly as possible, in regions or areas where such discrimination is prevalent;

(3) by publishing and disseminating reports and other information relating to such discrimination and to ways and means for eliminating it;

(4) by conferring, cooperating with, and furnishing technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other private and public agencies in formulating and executing policies and programs for the elimination of such discrimination;

(5) by receiving and investigating complaints charging any such discrimination and by investigating other cases where it has reason to believe that any such discrimination is practiced; and

(6) by making specific and detailed recommendations to the interested parties in any such case as to ways and means for the elimination of any such discrimination.

(b) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President describing in detail the investigations, proceedings, and hearings it has conducted and their outcome, the decisions it has rendered, and the other work



performed by it, and may make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable. The Commission may make such other recommendations to the President or any Federal agency as it deems necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act.

#### INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have the right to examine or copy any evidence of any person relating to any such investigation, proceedings, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(c) Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations, proceedings, or hearings.

(d) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(e) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person under this act, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing; any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by it as a contempt thereof.

(f) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

#### DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 6. The Commission shall make a study and investigation of discrimination in regard to hire, or tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, in the departments and agencies of the Federal Government because of race, creed, or color, and shall recommend to the Congress a specific plan to eliminate it and such legislation as it deems necessary to eliminate it.

#### WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

SEC. 7. Any person who shall willfully resist, impede, or interfere with, any member

of the Commission or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. TAFT is as follows:

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR TAFT IN CONNECTION WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO ESTABLISH A FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

I am today introducing a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practice Commission and to aid in eliminating discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color.

The bill establishes a Federal Commission of five with power to set up local commissions in all regions throughout the United States. The Commission is authorized to make comprehensive studies in each district to determine how discrimination in that district on grounds of race, creed, and color can best be eliminated, and full employment provided for Negroes and all other minority groups. It is given full power to call witnesses and inquire into specific cases of discrimination, make recommendations, and take every step to secure community interest and cooperation and voluntary compliance by employers and labor unions.

In my opinion the establishment of this Commission is justified by the fact that Negroes do not have the opportunities for employment enjoyed by white men. In many places they are the last to be employed and the first to be laid off. Custom and prejudice interfere with improvement in their position. Substantial progress was made during the war and the temporary Fair Employment Practices Commission, though without legal authority, contributed materially to that progress.

I feel that the compulsory provisions of the bill heretofore introduced in the Senate will hinder progress toward solving the problem rather than achieve it. Few realize how extensive these compulsory provisions are. They are modeled on the "unfair labor practice" provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and give to anyone who is refused employment or dismissed from a job the right to bring an action against the employer, alleging some motive of discrimination because the applicant or employee is white, black, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Czech, Pole, or German. Such motives are always possible to allege, and the question is left for decision to a board which is bound by no rules of evidence, and practically not subject to court review.

Abuses which come about under similar provisions of the National Labor Relations Act led to demands for its amendment by labor organizations themselves. As I see it, the compulsory act, if duplicated in every State as its proponents plan, will finally force every employer to choose his employees approximately in proportion to the division of races and religions in his district, because that will be his best defense to harassing suits. Race and religion will enter into every decision. Catholic institutions, for instance, will have to employ Protestants. The Methodist book concern will have to employ Catholics. White waiters and porters could insist upon most of the work in the Pullman sleepers and dining cars. In the long run this board would tell every employer how he must make up his labor force. The bill even includes national origin and ancestry, so that in a city like Cleveland, Ohio, employers could be sued by representatives of every nationality group particularly if they do not have members of that nationality employed in the particular office or plant.

In my opinion any such compulsory measure will create more bad racial and religious

feeling than any other method which can be pursued. I think it will do the colored race much more harm than good. Progress against discrimination must be made gradually and must be made by voluntary cooperation and education with encouragement from a Federal board, like that I propose, and State governments and boards, and not by inviting thousands of lawsuits which will get beyond the control even of the Fair Employment Practices Commission itself. A voluntary commission can develop different kinds of plans to increase good colored employment in different cities after studying the local conditions and the character of local industries. The method of solving the problem of Negro full employment in Cleveland may be entirely different from that which should be pursued in New York City or in Atlanta, Ga. No scientific study of the problem has yet been made, and that should be the first task of the boards I propose.

It is true that there may be a few recalcitrant employers, but if local committees are set up and sound plans developed I believe they will be few indeed. If there are a few, perhaps they can be bypassed and employment provided by other means. If the voluntary method fails to continue progress, the Commission is given power to recommend compulsory legislation. I should not oppose it as a last resort. Even then, I doubt if the unfair-labor-practice approach is the proper method of dealing with the situation. For instance, when a comprehensive plan of employment has been made, and efforts at voluntary compliance have failed, the board might be given the right to apply to a court for general approval of the plan, and a court order against an employer whose course of conduct interferes substantially with the success of the plan.

The bill which I am introducing proposes a constructive approach to one of the most difficult problems we face. It is so fair that I believe the opponents should be willing to withdraw their opposition.

#### BALANCED BUDGET FOR 1951

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution requiring the transmission to the Congress of a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1951.

The joint resolution is very brief, and I invite the attention of Senators to it. It provides that in addition to the budget required to be transmitted to the Congress by the President under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, the President shall transmit to Congress on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-first Congress a balanced budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, which shall set forth in summary and in detail, first, estimates of the receipts of the Government during such fiscal year under laws existing at the time such budget is transmitted; and, second, estimates of expenditures, not in excess of such receipts, for the support of the Government for such fiscal year, under laws so existing. That does not preclude the President from submitting, in addition, any budget he may wish to submit, but it does require him to submit a budget within the anticipated revenues.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 131) to require the transmission to the Congress of a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1951, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## WEBER BASIN PROJECT (UTAH) REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the Weber Basin Project (Utah) Report, from the Bureau of Reclamation, under date of July 15, 1949. Inasmuch as this report has been referred to and in effect made a part of Senate bill 2391, which is now public law, having been signed by the President, I ask unanimous consent that this report be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration to consider the question of having it printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

## ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ BEFORE THE KIWANIS CLUB, ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Kiwanis Club luncheon, Albuquerque, N. Mex., on Wednesday, September 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FORCED LABOR IN COMMUNIST RUMANIA—REPORT BY GEN. NICOLAE RADESCU

[Mr. GRAHAM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD portions of the report of Gen. Nicolae Radescu, former Prime Minister of Rumania, on forced labor in Communist Rumania, which appear in the Appendix.]

## ECONOMY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE FROM ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Honorable Failure, Senator," published in the Arkansas Democrat of August 31, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES—ARTICLE FROM THE KINGMAN JOURNAL

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding reduction of governmental expenditures, from the Kingman (Kans.) Journal of September 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## EMPLOYMENT IN THE OIL INDUSTRY—ARTICLE FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "One Million Eight Hundred and Eighty Thousand Are Employed by Oil Industry in the United States," published in the Oil City Derrick of September 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT AND PENNSYLVANIA VOTERS—ARTICLE BY JOHN M. CUMMINGS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Taft-Hartley Act 'Chains' Just Didn't Worry Voters," written by John M. Cummings, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## RESULTS OF ELECTION IN TWENTY-SIXTH PENNSYLVANIA DISTRICT—EDITORIAL FROM OIL CITY DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Spare the Cheers," published in the

Oil City Derrick of September 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PROPOSED COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY—LETTER FROM HON. DENNIS DELLWO

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the aspects of a proposed Columbia Valley Authority, written by Hon. Dennis Dellwo, and published in the Ronan (Mont.) Pioneer of September 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## KANSAS ANSWERS SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—ARTICLE BY ALVIN S. MCCOY AND RALPH H. MAJOR, JR.

[Mr. SCHOEPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Kansas Answers Socialized Medicine," written by Alvin S. McCoy and Ralph H. Major, Jr., and published in the September issue of Coronet, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FOR NAVAJO KNOWLEDGE—ARTICLE FROM NEWSWEEK

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "For Navajo Knowledge," published in Newsweek of September 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## SCHOOL BELLS TO RING FOR YOUNG NAVAJOS—EDITORIAL FROM THE SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "School Bells To Ring for Young Navajos," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of September 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

## MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING BILL—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR SPARKMAN

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a résumé of excerpts from a radio interview with Senator SPARKMAN on the subject of the middle-income housing bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

## FEDERAL EXPENDITURE AND REVENUE POLICY FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY—STATEMENT BY CONFERENCE OF UNIVERSITY ECONOMISTS

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Federal Expenditure and Revenue Policy for Economic Stability," drafted and unanimously approved by the National Planning Association's Conference of University Economists, September 16-18, 1949, Princeton University, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PROPOSED CHANGES IN LAW RELATING TO THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement with respect to Senate bill 2398 in connection with placing in the record certain correspondence dealing with that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in my correspondence I received on September 13 a statement of objection from the National Wool Growers Association which I now desire to place in the RECORD.

Upon receipt of this memorandum of objection, I contacted Mr. Watts, Chief of the Forest Service, and requested that he give me a memorandum explaining

the objections and answering them if he could.

The memorandum I received, dated September 19 from the Forest Service, attempts to explain all the objections raised by the National Wool Growers Association. I request that this memorandum also be included in the record at this point.

In addition to these memorandums I have received a number of communications from constituents in my State requesting favorable action on H. R. 5839 which is a companion measure to S. 2398. I now ask unanimous consent to place in the record a few of these telegrams.

There being no objection, the memorandum and other communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,  
Salt Lake City, Utah, September 14, 1949.  
Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: In accordance with our telegram to you today, enclosed is the position and reasons for the National Wool Growers Association's opposition to H. R. 5839.

It is true that in the hearings held before the House Agricultural Committee on this bill, we did not present a prepared statement, although at the time we did express our disapproval of section 12, which was later changed and on the surface did not seem too bad.

Since that time, however, the introduction of legislation which we feel was definitely proposed by the Forest Service has caused us considerable concern over the trend indicated in this legislation. We therefore feel that this whole question should be thoroughly discussed before the passage of H. R. 5839. We ask that you object to this bill when it appears on the Consent Calendar of the Senate and use your influence to see that the livestock industry has an opportunity to be heard before action is taken.

I think you will find that the reasons for our opposition are clearly stated in our memorandum enclosed.

With kindest personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

J. M. JONES.

NATIONAL WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION OPPOSES  
H. R. 5839 (S. 2398)

SEPTEMBER 13, 1949.

To Members of the United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

The bill H. R. 5839 (S. 2398) "to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes"—the so-called omnibus bill of the Forest Service—covers everything from the purchase of land, aircraft nursery stock, seed and testing materials; collection of money from purchasers of timber for brush disposal; furnishing meals, lodging, bedding, and fuel for users of natural forest resources and recreational activities for a fee; payment for telephone service for persons cooperating with the Forest Service; securing additional funds for propaganda; to requiring grazing permittees to make deposits of money for range improvements. In general, it is a move to lift many congressional and fiscal restrictions imposed upon other Federal agencies.

This bill gives the Forest Service more freedom in spending the taxpayers' money; enhances the ever-creeping power of this bureau; permits assessments of money without limitation on the users of natural resources for certain purposes and permits any residue therefrom to be kept for any use the Forest Service may see fit; bypasses the Appropriations Committee of the Congress, thereby



adding to the tremendous autocratic power of this bureau. The Forest Service is the sole judge of what is in the public interest.

Without attempting to cover the merits and demerits of all sections of the bill, some of which are of value and others doubtful in the manner in which they are presented, I should like to emphasize our main objection to section 12. This section, of course, applies to the range livestock users of the West, and let me say the livestock users are the true conservationists because only through the protection of the annual natural resource, grass, can they maintain their industry.

Certain exceedingly pertinent questions are properly raised in the mind of the range user in connection with section 12:

1. Is the Secretary of Agriculture through his representatives, the Forest Service officials, to be the interpreter of what actions are in the public interest? Is it not possible for him to make such regulations and rules as he sees fit without requesting or securing the advice of those who would foot the bill, the permittees? Would this not be autocratic government?

2. Is it not possible for the Forest Service to establish any fee it may desire for permitting grazing on the national forest? This could easily happen under the pretext of a range resurvey which is now being contemplated and has taken place in the State of Nebraska, where the base fee has been increased from 16 to 28 cents. Cannot the Forest Service say that the established fee will consist of (a) range improvement fee (any amount at their discretion); (b) administration fee (any amount), and require any grazing permittee, without his consent, to make deposits of money (sum in any amount) as a part of the established fee for the use of the range, which in the judgment of the Forest Service is desirable?

There is no check on reasonableness or necessity for such assessment. Any ranger with grandiose or fantastic ideas would have a blank signed check (on the permittee's bank) for any type of work, theoretical or otherwise, that he desired.

Regardless of any excess over actual cost, the permittee would not be entitled to a refund but such excess would be transferred to miscellaneous receipts, forest reserve fund, to be spent for propaganda or for any other purpose.

3. In the light of present arbitrary cancellation of grazing privileges, what assurance would a permittee have that he would enjoy—even for a short time—the improvement for which he paid but had no voice in approving?

4. Wouldn't it be better government, since range users are extremely desirous of securing much needed funds for improvement of forest ranges, to say that a part of the grazing fee shall be used for range improvement "if and when appropriated by Congress"?

It might appear to some that we are super-sensitive concerning the administration, without a basic law, of forest land grazing by the Forest Service, for example S. 2409, which would permit 10 percent of all forest receipts, for the past fiscal year about \$3,000,000, to be spent by forest officials for recreation without any necessity for congressional approval.

Take for example S. 1820 in terms of its long-range aspects, which could in the foreseeable future give control of vast areas of private land, not only in the West but North, South, and East, to the Forest Service through the medium of placing or withholding of Federal funds from the States in which the lands in question are located. This, in my opinion, is one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation ever introduced.

It is clearly seen, therefore, that it is not only the creeping power of this bureau in H. R. 5839 (S. 2398) which concerns us, and should all citizens of this country, but the possible picture of the future.

There is no doubt of the Forest Service's strength in molding public opinion (1) by the very nature of its operations, with a propagandist in every little town in the West near a forest area, with regional offices filled with men in strategic locations in the States, and with 160 employees for general administration—a total of 8,000 regional employees; (2) by the tremendous power that goes with a \$66,000,000 appropriation. Of the appropriation (around \$26,000,000) "for the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of national forests . . ." approximately \$23,000,000 (88 percent) is for personal services, covering salaries of 10 regional foresters, 137 forest supervisors, 63 assistant regional foresters, 260 foresters, 535 district rangers, 6 information specialists, and a list of other specialists. Better than a million dollars is actually earmarked for travel; \$200,000 for printing and binding. It is little wonder the average layman or even Congress is mystified by the complexity and number of appropriations involved. It is, therefore, easy to assume few if any questions could intelligently be raised in opposition to the Forest Service use of funds.

Because of this already complex operation it seems to us highly desirable that Congress be responsible for the appropriation of all Forest Service funds.

It is assumed that in the next session of Congress or in the near future, the President will present a plan to Congress for reorganization, and we hope simplifying, the administration of the natural resources of this country.

It seems to us highly desirable, when the President's plan is known, for Congress at that time to review thoroughly the problems of Federal land (forest and public lands) administration which at the present time are not interchangeable, and not at this time pass further legislation making it more difficult to reconcile the differences.

We earnestly request that no action by the Senate be taken on H. R. 5839 (S. 2398).

J. M. JONES,  
Secretary.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1949.  
Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Reference is made to Mr. Cardall's letter of September 16, with which he enclosed a letter of September 14 to you from J. M. Jones, secretary of the National Wool Growers Association and accompanying memorandum opposing H. R. 5839 (S. 2398). Mr. Cardall's letter requests an answer to the various objections raised by Mr. Jones.

The memorandum which accompanied Mr. Jones' letter is in part a blanket objection to what he describes as a measure to give more power to the Forest Service which he maintains would not be in the public interest. He enumerates a long list of minor functions covered by the bill and which he implies are new areas of authority for the Forest Service but which, for the most part, are matters as to which the Forest Service already has broad authority which merely needs minor clarification.

It seems to us that the very best answer which can be made to these generalities in Mr. Jones' letter is provided in Senate Report No. 1069 on this measure, from which I quote as follows:

"The purpose of this bill is to make a number of relatively minor changes in the laws relating to the Forest Service which will permit that Service to carry out more efficiently and more effectively the functions and duties imposed on it by Congress.

"The changes and improvements in the laws relating to the Forest Service which are proposed in this bill are the outgrowth of cumulative experience of the Service and are

based upon careful study. The changes proposed represent improvements which those charged with the administration of these laws believe that they can and should make in such administration.

"Rather than authorizing the appropriation of additional funds, most of the legislative changes proposed herein are designed to save the Government money, either directly or through more efficient use and administration of existing appropriations. The only authorizations for new appropriations are in section 14 and these are of a character to render more effective and efficient the whole functioning of the Forest Service.

"In reporting the bill in the Eightieth Congress, the committee said:

"The committee has gone over the bill very carefully, line by line, and is satisfied that there is not proposed any authorization beyond that actually needed to accomplish the job to be done, and that the enactment of this proposed legislation will greatly improve and render more effective and economical the functioning of the Forest Service."

This report makes it evident that the committees of Congress have given very careful scrutiny to this measure and are satisfied that it is designed to make for more effective and efficient government.

Now, with respect to section 12, we are really astonished that any of the stockmen are opposing the provisions of this section. This section of the bill merely confirms a practice which has been in effect under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for a great many years with the full knowledge and approval of the stockmen themselves. Under the prevailing practices, part of the fees paid by some permittees for use of the range are placed in a special category and made available for various range improvements which not only serve to facilitate the best management of the public range, but are of great benefit to the permittees themselves in handling their stock on the range and deriving the greatest benefit from their range use. A substantial part of the fund is used for the maintenance of existing range improvements, many of which were installed in cooperation with the stockmen themselves. The stockmen have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the adoption of this section of the bill, and I venture to say that it would be impossible to find more than a handful out of the more than 20,000 grazing permittees who would favor discontinuing the existing practice.

As pointed out on page 9 of the committee report, the principle of this section is the same as that embodied in section 3 of the so-called Knutson-Vandenberg Act of June 30, 1930 (16 U. S. C. 576-b), so that it merely follows a well-established principle which has long had the approval of Congress.

Beginning on page 2 of Mr. Jones' memorandum, he asks certain questions relating to section 12. The answer is that the adoption of this section of the bill would have no bearing whatever on the size of the grazing fees on the national forests. The Department now has complete authority to establish and modify fees, but the stockmen know very well that they have been repeatedly assured that before any general revision of grazing fees is undertaken they will be consulted and the study of possible revision would be carried on in cooperation with them. To repeat, this section would give absolutely no additional authority in relation to fixing fees to that already possessed by the Department of Agriculture.

Again, let me make it clear that there is a definite limit on the amount which any permittee can be called upon to deposit under this proposed legislation, because it is clear in the section itself and in the committee report (p. 2) that deposits under this section

would be merely a part of the established grazing fee and not in addition thereto.

Because of this latter fact, there is no reason why any excess should be returned to the permittee, as the total amount paid by him would be no more than he is ordinarily required to pay for the use of the range.

Furthermore, any excess which is transferred to miscellaneous receipts forest reserve fund is not available to the Forest Service for any purpose whatsoever but goes into the Treasury and is available for appropriation for any purpose which Congress may decide.

Finally, the intent of this section was quite thoroughly discussed in the House committee hearings and John B. Wilson, who, in his statement, said that he spoke for both the cattlemen and sheepmen, was obviously satisfied that section 12 was desirable and said that on the basis of the understood intent of the bill the cattlemen and the sheepmen would not have any objection. (P. 22 of hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Agriculture Committee on H. R. 2968 (superseded by H. R. 5839).)

Mr. Jones refers to other bills such as S. 2409 and S. 1820. Both of those bills were introduced on the initiative of their authors, but in any event they have absolutely nothing to do with H. R. 5839, and it seems to us unreasonable to take a position in opposition to a measure which has been found by congressional committees to be in the public interest simply because some other pieces of proposed legislation may contemplate measures with which livestock organizations are not in sympathy.

To conclude as to section 12, it is our feeling that any stockmen who are objecting to section 12 are not only working against their own interests but against the interests of thousands of other stockmen, because a continuation of established practices which this section would confirm will obviously benefit very materially the users of the range as well as the range itself.

And, finally, it seems to us clearly established by the portions of the committee report quoted at the outset of this letter, that it would be against the public interest to allow this proposed legislation to be defeated. Its enactment will measurably improve the protection and administration of many resources of the national forests, in addition to the range resource, which are of great concern to large and important groups of users other than the stockmen.

The enclosures with Mr. Cardall's letter are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE F. WATTS, Chief.  
By C. M. GRANGER.

SPANISH FORK, UTAH, September 19, 1949.  
Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

All members, 170, Spanish Fork Livestock Association, request your support bill S. 2398.

DANIEL A. GULL, President.

PROVO, UTAH, September 20, 1949.  
Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
Senate Office Building:

Have reviewed Senate bill 2398 now pending, and believe that it will provide more practicable procedure in handling of several forest and range management problems. We hope that this measure receives Senate and Presidential approval.

MARK ANDERSON, Mayor.

OGDEN, UTAH, September 20, 1949.  
Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
Senate Office Building:

S. 2398 and companion measure H. R. 5839 now on Consent Calendar in Senate have our full endorsement. Urge your support every

way possible. If enacted, economy of Utah and entire Western States will be immediately and progressively advanced. Our conclusion, bill provides proper facilities for expediting the reseeding of western areas so important to livestock economy.

E. J. FJELDSTED,  
Secretary, Western States Council.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, September 19, 1949.  
Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,  
Senate Office Building:

Urge your active assistance for favorable action on S. 2398. Legislation is essential in watershed and range-conservation program in Utah.

TOM JENSEN,  
Secretary, Associated Civics Clubs in  
Southern and Eastern Utah.

#### ECONOMY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. Ross Roy, of Detroit, Mich. We in Washington are dealing with large figures, which he calls "boxcar" figures. He has made some research into the question of Federal expenditures. He says, first, that if everyone in the United States cashed in all his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to \$44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

Second, if every urban home owner in this country sold his home, the total would amount to \$30,000,000,000, just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

Third, if every farmer in the country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to \$25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

Fourth, if every industry converted its net working capital into cash, the total would amount to \$39,000,000,000. Hardly enough to run the Government for 11 months.

These figures give us an idea as to how much \$43,000,000,000 or \$45,000,000,000 is when compared with the worth of these various assets of all the people of America.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROSS ROY, Inc.,  
Detroit, Mich., September 20, 1949.  
Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I, as well as dozens of my friends and business associates, was somewhat sickened when I read in the press a few days ago about the action of the Senate in voting against economy in our Federal Government.

I think that the average citizen cares little about how economies are effected but definitely wants to see them effected. In my opinion, the buck passing on whether or not the President should direct individual Government bureaus to effect the economies is beside the point. The fact remains that the present Congress has not voted for economy in government.

I realize that the average person has little conception of boxcar figures such as \$45,000,000,000. For your information, however, I would like to point out a few facts which I have had our research department obtain:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all of his life-insurance policies, the total

would amount to \$44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. If every urban home owner in this country sold his home, the total would amount to \$30,000,000,000. That's just enough to run the Government for 8 months.

3. If every farmer in this country sold his farm, farm equipment, and livestock, the total would amount to \$25,000,000,000. The Government could not run for 7 months on that amount of money.

4. If every industry converted its net working capital into cash, the total would amount to \$39,000,000,000. That's hardly enough to run the Government for 11 months.

In 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a Presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

All of this leads me to ask you one question: Is there room in the poorhouse for 149,000,000 people?

Very truly yours,

ROSS ROY.

#### AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, today is American Indian Day. The American Indian will be honored and saluted by the press, the radio, the general public, and even official Washington. What the American Indian actually desires is not so much empty honors, not so much saluting by the press, the radio, or the general public, or even official Washington, but to be treated as an American. He would like to see a little better showing of the characteristic fair play of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief statement concerning the American Indian.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

On this, the 23d day of September 1949, the occasion of the observance of American Indian Day, I am more than pleased to note that the American Indian is being honored and saluted by the press, radio, the general public, and official Washington.

One of the finest tributes that can be paid to the Indian on this important day is the coast-to-coast radio program, The Song of the Tom-Tom, arranged by the Mutual Broadcasting System in conjunction with the Nation-wide Citizens Committee of the National Congress of American Indians and designed to spotlight the cultural aspects of Indian life. Delivering an address commemorating this occasion will be Chief Justice H. B. Johnson, of the Oklahoma Supreme Court, a full-blooded Cherokee Indian. Also paying their respects to the first Americans will be songstress Kay Starr, also of Indian descent, folk singer Burl Ives, Roy Rogers, and Dale Evans.

Besides these tributes, the program will acquaint the Nation's listeners with secret Indian ceremonial rites and tribal songs never before aired. Ted Robertson, producer of the Straight Arrow program, and his assistant, Ray Kemper, devoted months of research gathering these sacred Indian rituals in addition to making a special trip to the Intertribal Indian Ceremonial at Gallup, N. Mex., where thousands of Indians, members of the various North American Indian tribes, were gathered for their annual fiesta. While the Indians were celebrating their holiday,



Robertson and Kemper were busily engaged recording the activities for posterity.

Perhaps all of us are not acquainted with the historical background of real-estate holdings by the Pueblo Indians of my State. The legal title to their lands are contained in land grants to the Pueblos granted as far back as Charles V and Phillip II of Spain. Those grants to the Pueblo Indians have protected them in their real property up to the moment, having been recognized under the short control of New Mexico by Mexico and by the United States. Ever since then they have lived in peace and have known that their titles could not be lost no matter how avaricious the white man might be.

So, as the United States Senator for New Mexico, a State with a large Indian population, I wish to add my thanks and congratulations to Mr. Robertson, Mr. Kemper, the Straight Arrow program, and to persons who gave their time to acquaint the American public with the cultural background of our American Indian life.

#### AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2944, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2944) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide survivorship benefits for widows or widowers of persons retiring under such Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 2 of the House bill strike out all after the period in line 1 down through the period in line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The life annuity of the officer or employee making such election shall be reduced by 5 per centum of so much thereof as does not exceed \$1,500, plus 10 per centum of the balance of such life annuity, and shall be further reduced by three-fourths of 1 per centum of such life annuity for each full year, if any, the designated wife or husband is under the age of sixty at the date of such retirement, but the total reduction shall in no case be more than 25 per centum of such life annuity."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,  
RALPH E. FLANDERS,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

TOM MURRAY,  
JIMMY MORRISON,  
EDWARD H. REES,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would simply like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina if

it is a unanimous report, signed by all the Senate conferees.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is unanimous, and is signed by all the Senate conferees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does it differ very much from the bill as it was passed by the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is a little less liberal than the bill as passed by the Senate. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for a deduction of 5 percent of the amount the surviving spouse is left. The conference report would make a deduction of 5 percent on the first \$1,500 of the annuity, whatever it may be, each year; and for anything above that amount, the rate will remain the same as provided by the present law. So the conference report is not quite so liberal as the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was agreed to by all the conferees, was it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IN RUSSIA

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, less than an hour ago the President of the United States issued a statement to the American people which is of transcendent importance. I wish to read it into the Record:

I believe the American people, to the fullest extent consistent with national security, are entitled to be informed of all developments in the field of atomic energy. That is my reason for making public the following information.

We have evidence that within recent weeks an atomic explosion occurred in the U. S. S. R.

Ever since atomic energy was first released by man, the eventual development of this new force by other nations was to be expected. This probability has always been taken into account by us.

Nearly 4 years ago I pointed out that "scientific opinion appears to be practically unanimous that the essential theoretical knowledge upon which the discovery is based is already widely known. There is also substantial agreement that foreign research can come abreast of our present theoretical knowledge in time" and, in the three-nation declaration of the President of the United States and the Prime Ministers of the United Kingdom and of Canada, dated November 15, 1945, it was emphasized that no single nation could in fact have a monopoly of atomic weapons.

This recent development emphasizes once again, if indeed such emphasis were needed, the necessity for that truly effective enforceable international control of atomic energy which this Government and the large majority of the members of the United Nations support.

Mr. President, I think the Senate should be informed that, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I was advised of this development at about 3:15 o'clock yesterday. Last evening I sent notices to the members of the joint committee to assemble this morning. We did assemble, with the members of the Commission and other

officials who are engaged in work of an allied nature, and thoroughly discussed this subject. The committee will, of course, continue to meet after sufficient time for deliberation upon the implications, military and political, which this event brings about.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the news which has been given to us through the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and which the Chief Executive has given to the Nation—that Russia has exploded an atomic bomb—is indeed of transcendent importance. The decisions which we shall have to make flowing from that news will be of unsurpassed gravity and fatefulness. I hope we may reach these decisions without fear, without hysteria, and by repelling all thoughtless clamor.

I hope the national decisions which will have to be made, however they may be made, will express the highest level of our national intelligence, our finest instincts for the preservation of the best in humanity, and that the execution of those decisions may be characterized by resolute, undeviating courage.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, some months ago I submitted a resolution which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The resolution calls for a unilateral declaration on our part that we will not use the atomic bomb unless it is used against us. Supposing this news to be true, I would now be inclined to suggest that we enter into negotiations with Russia looking to an agreement that neither nation shall use the atomic bomb unless attacked by it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assumes that the routine matters referred to in the unanimous-consent agreement are disposed of, and that the matter now before the Senate is House bill 5007. Discussions will proceed on that basis, regardless of the subject.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have been aware, since its introduction, of the resolution which has been mentioned by the Senator from Vermont. This is probably as good a time as any to point out that the United States Congress does not need at this late date, nor was it necessary at the time the distinguished Senator offered the resolution, to point out to all the world that the Government of the United States had indicated forthrightly and squarely to all the world that what we wanted to do with atomic energy was to employ it for the benefit of mankind, not for its destruction. I merely make that observation because I think it is important to point out that we did rise to the heights of moral leadership at a time when conditions seemed to demand it, and we did not let 2 or 3 or 4 years go by before we initiated our effort. The great English Socialist, Laski, who certainly bears us no great friendship, was compelled to testify, when we made known our proposals for international control, that one of the finest pages ever written by any country in the history of mankind had thus been written by these proposals. We said to all the world, "Here it is. Let us make use of it together. All we ask are effective safeguards that it shall not be used to destroy us."

No, Mr. President, our record in this field cannot be challenged or gainsaid. Thank God, now that the time has come which some of us foresaw would come, we can, in the wise words uttered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], proceed to the deliberation of this matter in a way that will do us credit, with nothing whatsoever to be ashamed of in our past.

I can only reiterate the plea of the Senator from Colorado that there be no hysteria.

I wish to reemphasize that our entire atomic program has been based upon the assumption that this very thing would come to pass, because we knew it would come to pass. I call attention to the fact that in 1943, as divulged by the Canadian spy trials, the masters of the Kremlin were busily engaged at that time in securing what knowledge they could of this great secret of nature. Of course it is only to be observed that probably they started their project at that time.

Mr. President, I think that concludes at this time what I have to say on this subject, but I wish again to point out to the Senate that, as individual Senators and as citizens of the United States, of the record thus far written we can be decidedly proud.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is absent. I am a member of that committee. I have listened with a great deal of respect to what the Senators from Connecticut and Colorado have said, and I concur in their statements. The question they have discussed naturally brings to our minds the question of defense. I can only say as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, from the many meetings of that committee which I have attended, in the Pentagon and in the Capitol, that I believe our military leaders are proceeding with deliberateness, with intellectual capacity, with efficiency, and with courage, to plan the defense of this country in any emergency, including the emergency which may be brought more to the fore by the knowledge we have received this morning. I believe the information as to this new development will cause no particular change in their minds, and occasion them no great surprise, and that we may have complete confidence in their proceeding with the defense and security of our country in a way that will give all of us the greatest possible confidence.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to take but a moment. Throughout the debate on the arms-to-Europe proposal, which to my mind was both unduly limited and inadequate, I was troubled, as a citizen and as a Senator, because I thought we were working in a vacuum; we were not in possession of all the facts on which a completely adequate decision could be made for the benefit of the country and the world. Since the Senate passed the military-assistance bill, not a day has passed until we have laid before us a bolt of information so pregnant, so delicate and complicated that it undeniably would have changed what we did yesterday.

I should like to say, as one who thinks we live in an age in which the survival of humanity itself is at stake, that in the future any branch of the Government, or any individual within any branch, either executive or legislative, which has in its possession any information on which accurate decisions must be based should lay it before this body in time for us to consider it before taking action, as we did yesterday; not knowing in that instance what we did or where this Nation and the other countries of the world were going.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I will only say to the Senator from Washington that the news which has been divulged now reinforces the belief of the Senator from Connecticut that he voted wisely yesterday.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will permit me to respond briefly, I have a perfect understanding of the integrity and views of the Senator from Connecticut. The point I was making, however, is that most Senators, having no knowledge whatever of the announcement which the President was to make this morning, voted yesterday, without information adequate to the task. If we keep on doing that, I wish to state, not alone to my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, but to every other Senator and to every other American citizen, we are going to make mistakes for which there will be no excuse and from which there will be no escape. Any decision which overlooks or ignores facts is a decision not to be trusted. If the President has known for days that the Russians possessed an atomic weapon, I think it incredible that he did not so advise the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator ever think of the possibility that, had the announcement been made yesterday, which the Senator claims might well have been made, it would have influenced the vote taken at 6 o'clock last night? Does the Senator also realize that the President had to be definitely assured by his advisers as to the definiteness of the information, before making an announcement of this kind and character?

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to say to the Senator that if the information, as released by the President this morning, was a fact, regardless of what anyone would have thought about it in terms of influence, that information ought to have been laid before the Senate before we decided to pursue a course of new and dangerous action for this country and the world.

#### MILITARY PAY BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5007) to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised committee amendments are pending. Does the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Illinois wish

the committee amendments to be considered first?

Mr. LUCAS. I think perhaps we should start on the committee amendments, if that is agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, and in accordance with the custom and precedents, the committee amendments will be considered first, before other amendments are offered. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The amendments were, on page 2, in the table of contents, under the subhead "Title IV—Provisions relating to retirement, retirement pay, separation and severance pay for physical disability," in section 406, after the word "of", to insert "temporary"; in section 408, after the word "from", to insert "intentional"; on page 9, section 201, in the table entitled "Commissioned Officers", after "0-8", to strike out "\$877.50" in each column and insert in lieu thereof "\$926.25"; in the line beginning "0-7", to strike out "729.00" in each column and insert in lieu thereof "769.50"; on the same page, in the second table, under the heading "Commissioned Officers," in the line beginning "0-8", to strike out "\$877.50" in each column and insert in lieu thereof "\$926.25" in each column; in the line beginning "0-7", to strike out "\$729.00" and insert in lieu thereof "\$769.50" in each column; on page 10, line 3, after the word "officers", to insert "(including warrant officers heretofore retired)"; on page 19, in the table, in the line beginning "0-8", to strike out "\$210.00" and insert "\$150"; in the line beginning "0-7", to strike out "\$210.00" and insert "\$150.00"; on page 20, line 2, after the word "duty", to strike out "or may prescribe that members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay who are performing duties, other than those prescribed in subsection (a) of this section, in certain areas or under certain conditions which involve more than ordinary military risk or danger shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive incentive pay for hazardous duty either at rates not to exceed those prescribed in subsection (b) of this section or at rates not to exceed those prescribed in subsection (c) of this section, as may be determined by the President, in accordance with the pay grade to which assigned or in which distributed for basic pay purposes or their ranks, grades, or ratings, as the case may be"; in section 207, on page 22, line 13, after the word "time", to insert "amounting to more than six years"; in section 302, on page 27, in the table, in the line beginning "E-4 (less than 7 years service) after the footnote number "1" to insert "2", and in the same line, under the column headed "with dependents", to insert "\$45.00"; in the next line, after "E-3", to insert "2", and in the same line in the column headed "With dependents", to insert "\$45.00"; in the next line, after "E-2", to insert "2", and in the same line in the column headed "With dependents", to insert "45.00"; in the next line, after "E-1", to insert "2", and in the same line, in the column headed "with dependents," to insert "45.00"; at the bottom of the table, after footnote numbered 1, to insert a new footnote, as follows "2 Considered at all times as



without dependents pursuant to subsection (a) of this section"; in section 402, on page 35, line 14, after the word "the", to insert "intentional"; in line 20, after the words "of the", to strike out "direct"; on page 36, line 22, after the word "the", to insert "intentional"; on page 38, after the words "of the", to insert "intentional"; in line 19, after the words "of the", to strike out "direct"; on page 41, line 1, after the word "based", to insert the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That the disability retirement pay of any member whose name is carried on the temporary disability retired list shall, for so long as his name is carried on such list, be not less than 50 per centum of the basic pay upon which the computation is based."

On page 45, after line 14, to strike out:

(h) Disability retirement pay computed on the basis of years of active service shall not be deemed to be a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country within the meaning of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

(h) That part of the disability retirement pay computed on the basis of years of active service which is in excess of the disability retirement pay that a member would receive if such disability pay were computed on the basis of percentage of disability shall not be deemed to be a pension, annuity, or similar allowance for personal injuries or sickness resulting from active service in the armed forces of any country within the meaning of section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

On page 51, line 5, in the subhead, after the word "of", to insert "Temporary"; on page 53, line 4, in the subhead, after the word "From", to insert "Intentional"; and in section 531, page 100, line 16, after the word "amended", to insert "is hereby repealed."

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky desires to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, if we are going to pass the bill—

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are going to pass it pretty quick.

Mr. LUCAS. I have an agreement with the Senator from Nebraska, who is absent, the minority leader, that we will not vote on the bill until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to be recognized?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Kentucky is recognized, I propound the following unanimous-consent request: I ask unanimous consent

that on Monday, September 26, 1949, at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed to House bill 5007, the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and upon the passage of the said bill: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the bill shall be received.

I ask further unanimous consent that the time between 3 p. m. and 5 p. m. on said day be controlled by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and equally divided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I note that a number of Senators are not able to be present today. I believe there will not be much debate on the bill, and I believe the unanimous-consent agreement will be entirely satisfactory, since it will give both sides, in the event opposition develops, an opportunity to discuss the bill for at least 2 hours.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the bill is still open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to announce that, the bill having been read the third time, it will be necessary to set aside that action in order to offer an amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I happen to know that there are on the desk two amendments which have been printed and proposed to be offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that five amendments have been printed. When the Chair asked whether there were amendments to be offered from the floor and none were forthcoming, the third reading of the bill was ordered. Without objection, the order for the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill will be rescinded, so that amendments may be offered. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the vote is taken on the bill at 5 o'clock, I assume the amendments will be voted upon at the same time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's intention to take up the Executive Calendar, particularly the nomination of Mr. Butterworth, and other nominations as to which there are some contentions?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what the Senator from Illinois proposes to do. Following the disposition of the pending bill on Monday at 5 o'clock, we shall then proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar, which includes the nomination of Mr. Butterworth, which has been passed over for some time, as well as nominations for positions in the United Nations, and other nominations on the calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So there may be an evening session. The session will run until those nominations are determined. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Blandford, a member of the professional staff of the House Committee on Armed Services, may be permitted to be on the floor during the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, this bill is presented by the Committee on Armed Services as a vital, component part of America's program of defensive preparedness. I deeply regret that the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent on important business pertaining to our country's national defense. The Senator from Maryland has devoted himself diligently and assiduously to the study and preparation of this bill, and has ardently and vigorously supported it in the committee. It is upon his request that I now present it for the consideration of the Senate.

We in the United States are a peaceful people. We abhor offensive war, but we believe in maintaining what George Washington called a "respectably defensive posture." Through the ages idealists have dreamed, saints have prayed, and poets have sung that there would dawn a millennium of universal peace, an era of peace on earth and good will among nations, a time when men would really "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks," according to the Book of Isaiah. That is a sublime ideal, a beautiful dream.

With many of my colleagues, I have supported every measure which I believed would promote amity among nations and be conducive to international good will. We ought to adhere to the United Nations, support the Atlantic Pact, and fulfill all of our solemn obligations as signatories of those monumental efforts for the prevention of war and the preservation of peace. Yet, until human nature changes and there can be purged from the minds and hearts of people composing nations such attributes as hate, malice, jealousy, envy, cupidity, greed for gain, lust for power, and ambition for conquest, overnight the most fraternal treaty may become a mere scrap of paper, and in one fateful hour the most solemn covenant may dissolve into a rope of sand.

A few short years ago we met the greatest crisis in the history of the world. We have always been a peaceful people, with no militaristic tendency, no desire for war; our highest national ambition always having been to preserve peace and friendship with all the nations of the world. Then we had a challenge to everything closest to our hearts. When that supreme test came we mobilized our human and material resources in building the mightiest military machine

whose martial rumbling has ever rocked this reeling earth. The greatest armed force the world has ever seen came home, leaving the charred wreckage of German and Japanese cities as stark and bloody monuments to the folly and futility of totalitarianism and world conquest.

Yet, today we stand in the awful shadow of war. We must be prepared against the dangers of war. Preparedness is now, as it has ever been, the surest bulwark against aggression and the best insurance against war.

I have long believed that if the imperial impersonation of ambitious, truculent militarism, Kaiser Wilhelm, and the slimy, grisly, unspeakable Hitler, had realized and had believed that the United States both could and would move into a war for the preservation of civilization, with all of this country's might, neither of them would have started on the road to aggression that enveloped most of the civilized world with flame and led to a condition in which the soil of their own country was seared by the fires and riven by the plowshare of war.

The only language totalitarian people comprehend and the only language ambitious dictators respect is the language which, when translated literally, means the irresistible power of invincible armed force. We cannot again depend on allies to hold an enemy at bay until we can prepare to destroy that enemy, as we did a few years ago. We owe it to our country, to its principles and ideals, to its hopes and aspirations, to everything we hold most dear; we owe it to the mothers and the fathers who must furnish the manpower in time of war; we owe it to the Little Boy Blues who prattle at our knees, wear the little soldier suits and the little sailor suits, and play with little toy guns and little toy swords, to prepare so well that they shall not have to march to a carnival of carnage, as the fathers of most of them did in the recent world war.

In time of war we get most of the best and strongest young men in our country in the service. We would have most of them in service even if we did not have the draft. But in time of peace, when young men are looking for careers, when they are weighing the possibilities of the future, when they are comparing the opportunities of various careers, civil and military, when they are trying to decide whether to take up the profession of arms or some other profession as a career, it is natural and proper that they should consider their obligations, their responsibilities, and their opportunities for service. It is only natural that in that consideration they should take cognizance of the prospect of remuneration and retirement in whatever profession they may choose.

I could call no greater witness than the man whose statement I propose to read now. I have no doubt that when true history is recorded, when this period can be viewed in perspective, the name of Gen. Omar Bradley will be written in the clear blue along with the names of the greatest military captains of all time.

Under date of August 29, 1949, General Bradley wrote to the distinguished majority leader of this body, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], a letter in which he told about his recent trip to Europe. He said that wherever he and his associates, Admiral Denfeld and General Vandenberg, went, they were asked this question: "Will Congress pass the pay bill at this session?" He stated in his letter:

In the minds of the members of the armed forces and their families, it has become more than just a deserving pay raise and a revision of an antiquated structure. It is apparent, from what they have to say, that they believe it has become a mark of uncertainty as to the regard which the Congress and the people hold for those in the service.

I arrive at one inescapable conclusion: Either we place the armed services in a better position to attract and retain competent individuals by enacting the military-pay bill, or we accept a progressive downgrading of the caliber of personnel of the armed services. I am sure you will agree with me that the international position of the United States makes the acceptance of the latter hazardous in the extreme.

I am sure when I ask you to give this particular legislation every opportunity at your command in the Senate I speak for every member of the armed forces, and for their families.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

Mr. President, the purpose of the pending bill, H. R. 5007, the Career Compensation Act of 1949, is to establish for the seven uniformed services a compensation pattern which will attract, and retain on a career basis, first-class men and women in the armed services, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. As a part of that objective the bill proposes a complete revision of the present pay pattern, as well as a long-needed revision of the laws governing physical-disability retirement. It also provides a necessary change from the wartime system of family allowances, and a modification of our wartime system of bonuses for overseas service.

This bill is not simply a piece of "cost-of-living" legislation. The committee does not suggest that the personnel of our uniformed services are not able to eke out a living from the present pay scales. We do contend, however, as I shall attempt to document in the remarks which are to follow, that the present pattern of compensation is rapidly proving itself to be seriously inadequate in attracting a sufficient number of men and women of suitable ability to a career in our uniformed services.

Another quotation I should like to make is from the statement General Bradley made before the Armed Services Committee in the hearings we held on the bill. I shall read only an excerpt from the part of his statement I should like to have included in the RECORD. General Bradley said:

Our great strength in the United States for peace and for war lies in our agriculture, our industry, and our whole economy. But if the armed services are to be called upon to protect in modern, technical, more complex warfare these United States, we must have

men of ability, who equal the best men our system of government and way of life can provide.

There is no need to deceive ourselves, a revision will cost money. Despite the ultimate value of its long-term objectives, its immediate effect means more spending. What we must prove to your satisfaction is that the benefits of a pay revision are worth what it will cost.

Mr. President, that is what the committee proposes to prove. General Bradley continued:

We must explain why premium personnel are essential to the efficient operation of our armed forces and show how an antiquated pay schedule from the horse-trolley age is making it increasingly difficult for us to get and keep quality men for a quality security system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks the portions of General Bradley's statement before the committee which I shall mark and give to the reporter.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

General BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, and member of the committee, if I were to choose an item of legislation which I would particularly wish to testify before your committee, I would select the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Not selfishly, for I have been more than rewarded for my services. The United States Army has permitted me, and thousands like me, to pay my way honorably in a career of service to the Nation. But rather I come to speak for the younger men of this generation, and for the next generation upon whom we must rely for the future security of this Nation.

As I look back over the past 30 years, I believe that the Army's system of professional education, which was revitalized and expanded after World War I, was one of the greatest contributions to the winning of World War II. For it provided us, in our small nucleus of Regular officers and our larger reinforcement of capable National Guard and Reserve officers, with a skilled leadership, competent to face the most difficult tactical and strategic problems thrust upon us.

And as the multitude of postwar problems arose for the armed forces after World War II, it became apparent that new career incentives, to hold, and to attract men who can repeat and improve upon the performance of my generation, would be our first priority problem.

As long as qualified men respond in a free economy to the opportunity for initiative and the prospect of reward, we must offer qualified men in the armed forces compensation comparable to that awaiting their superior capacities elsewhere.

The school system that held the key to our successful leadership will be of little value if it must offer its teachings to succeeding years of enlisted men and officers who are not capable of learning the lessons, and later applying the principles and tactical doctrine devised by that outstanding professional educational system.

Our great strength in the United States, for peace and for war, lies in our agriculture, our industry, and our whole economy. But if the armed services are to be called upon to protect, in modern, technical, more complex warfare, these United States, we must have men of ability, who equal the best men our



system of government and way of life can provide.

Even though you are in complete agreement with the need for an upward pay revision, I realize that other considerations must be weighed carefully by this committee in making its recommendations. Because theirs is the labor that produces the taxes that provide for the Nation's defense, the American people may reasonably ask why it is that the armed forces must at this time add to the existing cost of Government the further burden of a major pay revision.

There is no need to deceive ourselves, a revision will cost money. Despite the ultimate value of its long-term objectives, its immediate effect means more spending. What we must prove to your satisfaction is that the benefits of a pay revision are worth what it will cost.

We must explain why premium personnel are essential to the efficient operation of our armed forces and show how an antiquated pay schedule from the horse-trolley age is making it increasingly difficult for us to get and keep quality men for a quality security system.

And yet at a time when industry was granting its second and third rounds of pay increases, men in the services are waiting patiently and uncomplainingly for the American people to correct their pay scales.

I do not contend—even now—that a man need take the vows of poverty to wear the uniform of his country. But I do contend that first-class men in the military profession today do serve their country because of the satisfaction they find in that service, rather than in any financial rewards they gain from it.

I am sure it was never intended that the wives and children of military men be burdened with continual sacrifice in their living standards because their wage earners elected careers in the armed forces. Too many of our most promising officers and noncommissioned officers are torn in conflict between a choice of duty to their country and duty to their children. We have reached a pathetic condition when men of superior capabilities are unable to satisfy both. And nowhere is this more apparent than among our colonels and commanders who in their prime of life and peak of efficiency find themselves compensated at the pay rates of their fathers in the gaslight age.

Just as success is an American characteristic, so is the ambition to work to the top. In the armed services the top ranks of general and admiral represent the achievement of this success and ambition.

In the discussion of the bill in the House of Representatives great emphasis was placed on the pay of the "brass" and the top-side rank, and some of the remarks uttered under the cloak of equalization vilified the top positions in our armed forces. These comments, which could only tend to cause a rift between officers and men, and which contributed little to the evaluation of the merits of the legislation, I can assure you, were not well taken by the men and women of the Army.

However, since there was also emphasis on economy in the pay of our top echelon of management, I think it is important to call it to your attention. One of the objectives of the Hook Commission was to arrange the pay scale in proportion to the responsibility, and the years of training and specialization that the job demanded, and provide some equalization in compensation with our top executives of business and industry.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, the armed services alone represent a capital or plant account investment of \$75,000,000,000. They require for their operation an annual budget of approxi-

mately \$15,000,000,000. In times of peace, as well as in time of war, they are called upon to fulfill responsibilities which are not only complex and difficult, but are vital to our national security. An organization so vast, and charged with responsibility so vital to our way of life, must be led and manned by men who are outstanding in ability, character, patriotism, and courage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In our defense establishment, operating this very expensive force, spending a vast sum of money every year, it is necessary to have men of experience. I have before me some figures with relation to the Navy, about which, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I was particularly concerned for several years. These figures show that reenlistments in the fiscal year 1949 in the Navy number 31.5 percent, as compared with 81 percent in the fiscal year 1939, and that at the various training stations there were approximately 23,475 recruits every month, and enlisted men to the number of 14,355 were required to work with them. In addition to that, there were 20,335 enlisted men in training at class A and class B schools, and 7,142 men in transit. So a total of 65,357 men of the Navy personnel were engaged either in being trained or in training, or in transit. This represented 17.8 percent of the total enlisted strength of the Navy, and at a pay scale, on an annual basis, of \$156,856,800. So that what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is now saying is extremely important. If we are going to operate this great establishment of ours with efficiency, we must have experienced men, and the turn-over under the present rate is extremely high. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Senator's statement is entirely correct. I thank the eminent Senator from Massachusetts for his splendid contribution to the discussion. He has had an important part in conducting the hearings and in drafting the legislation, and it has no more able advocate in this body.

PRUDENCE DEMANDS THAT WE SAFEGUARD THE SOURCE OF FUTURE GREAT LEADERS

Mr. President, the military leadership which our officers and men have given to the Nation during two recent world wars has been monumental and superb. Such great leaders as Pershing, Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Patton, Nimitz, King, Halsey, Vandegrift, Spaatz, Arnold, and many others have written some of the brightest pages in American history. The millions of young Americans who followed them in battle, on land, on sea, and in the air, have in "daring deeds that dazzle faith," glorified American arms and added new luster to every star and every stripe in Old Glory's sacred folds. If we are to "make assurance double sure" that we shall have men of similar caliber to meet any possible future emergency and, more important

still, to constitute a deterrent to aggression anywhere in the world, ordinary prudence dictates that we should continually examine our career services in the light of existing conditions, and insure that they attract today the leaders of tomorrow.

LACK OF ADEQUATE COMPENSATION A HANDICAP IN GETTING GOOD PEOPLE

With the end of hostilities in 1945 the Nation began the task of converting our vast temporary wartime Military Establishment into a relatively small permanent organization, geared to the long-time needs of the future. As this conversion process got under way it soon became apparent that the retention of the best of its personnel was a major problem in each of the uniformed services. The problem was not exclusively one of quantity; it primarily was one of quality. Of the millions of men who made up the Nation's mighty war machine, only an astonishingly small proportion from among the very best chose to remain permanently in the armed services. This disturbing situation became apparent as the various officer-integration programs were undertaken. Notwithstanding the fact that adequate numbers of individuals to fill these vacancies were available, the condition remained that the services were retaining only a comparatively small proportion of the more outstanding individuals who had served during the days of war. The several services, as well as the Secretary of Defense, devoted a great deal of study to the ascertainment of the cause of this obvious trend. Out of the numerous and diverse reasons which influence individuals in deciding whether to adopt a military career, it soon became apparent that the outmoded pattern which the services offered in the way of career compensation was a major deterrent in securing adequate numbers of qualified individuals for the postwar establishment.

PRESENT MILITARY PAY STRUCTURE HAS BECOME OUTMODED

There has been no general realignment of the military pay structure for over 40 years. In the meantime there have been numerous piecemeal adjustments within the general framework of the structure, each change having been made in response to a specific situation, but without much thought to the general compensation pattern. As a consequence the laws governing basic pay, special pay, allowances and retirement pay developed along completely uncoordinated lines, to form what is now a literal hodgepodge. It can be fairly stated that the Federal Government today actually has no identifiable plan which governs the career compensation of the uniformed services. The pattern is a legislative crazy quilt. When this situation is measured against the \$75,000,000,000 investment involved and the approximately \$4,000,000,000 annual pay roll, it becomes obvious that remedial action is imperative.

THE HOOK COMMISSION

In recognition of this need, late in 1947 the then Secretary of Defense, devoted public servant and noble patriot, the late Mr. James Forrestal, appointed

from among outstanding leaders in civil life an Advisory Commission on Service Pay. Generally referred to as the Hook Commission, out of recognition for its distinguished chairman, Mr. Charles R. Hook, this group of eminent American leaders investigated the situation for over a year before submitting their detailed report. The work of this Commission was carried out with thoroughness and objectivity. It utilized fully the numerous studies which had been in progress for nearly 2 years within the services themselves. It also had available the report of an able committee of the House of Representatives, headed by the able Representative ELSTON, of Ohio. As a result not only of this Commission's painstaking research, but also of the splendid qualifications of the members appointed to the Commission, Mr. Charles R. Hook, head of the American Rolling Mills Co.; Father John J. Cavanaugh, the illustrious president of Notre Dame University; Mr. Keith S. McHugh, vice president of the Bell Telephone Co.; and Mr. Lawrence H. Whiting, of Whiting & Co., the findings of the Hook Commission are regarded as a thoroughly sound foundation upon which to base legislation designed to provide a career-compensation plan for the uniformed services.

#### HISTORY IN THE HOUSE

In February 1949 a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, under the capable chairmanship of Representative KILDAY, of Texas, began hearings on a bill drafted to implement the recommendations of the Hook Commission. These hearings lasted for nearly 3 months; the printed record covers over 2,000 pages. The result of this labor—the so-called Kilday bill—was then reported to the full committee, and ultimately to the House, where it was given very critical scrutiny. After considerable debate the bill was referred back to the House Committee on Armed Services. This committee restudied the problem and revised its original bill, with the result that the pending bill, H. R. 5007, was reported back to the House, and was passed by voice vote on June 15, 1949. The Senate committee placed several amendments in the bill which have already been adopted today.

#### THIS BILL DOES NOT CONTAIN ALL OF THE HOOK PROPOSALS

H. R. 5007 does not propose to implement all of the recommendations of the Hook Commission, nor does it conform exactly to the details of all of the recommendations made by the Commission with respect to the material actually contained in the bill. However, the Hook Commission supported the bill as passed by the House, and as it has been reported to the Senate. The recommendations made by the Commission in the field of nondisability retirement were not included by the House Committee on Armed Services, nor are they included in the Senate version of the bill. The following excerpt from the report explains the committee's position in this matter:

Originally the proposed act contained revisions of voluntary and involuntary retirement laws. The committee was of the opinion that the subject of voluntary and involuntary retirement was so complex, so vast,

and would have such far-reaching effects upon the services that an attempt to revise or rewrite these laws should be held in abeyance until some future date, when it could be made as a separate study. Furthermore, it should be remembered that the committee has within the past 3 years carefully considered all of the voluntary and involuntary retirement laws, as indicated by Public Law 305 of the Seventy-ninth Congress and Public Laws 381 and 810 of the Eightieth Congress.

It should be observed that delay in voluntary and involuntary retirement revisions will have no budgetary impact, and for that reason can be permitted. On the other hand, any delay in revision of the physical disability retirement system would have a very serious budgetary impact, and such revision is therefore undertaken in this bill.

#### THE BILL PROPOSES THREE BASIC CHANGES FROM EXISTING PROCEDURES

Before proceeding to a more detailed discussion of the provisions of the bill I should like to point out what we of the committee regard as the most important basic changes proposed by the bill, of which there are three. The first change deals with the influence of longevity upon rates of compensation. Under existing practices an individual acquires an in-grade increase in compensation amounting to 5 percent of his base pay for each 3 years of service. This increase accrues even though the individual is not promoted, or required to assume any added responsibility. As an example, he might enter the service in the lowest enlisted grade and serve continuously in that grade for 30 years, meanwhile receiving a graduated series of in-grade increases throughout his 30 years of service. The same situation is true in regard to officers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to commend the able Senator from Kentucky for the fine presentation he is making of this measure, and also the Armed Services Committee for bringing the measure to the floor of the Senate for action.

The able Senator may recall that back in 1945, I believe it was, I was privileged to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives along with the Senator from Kentucky. I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and was chairman of the subcommittee which handled pay measures. We tried at that time to report a bill which would do somewhat the job which is now sought to be done. The able Senator may recall that we were able to get pay increases for all enlisted grades and for officers through the grade of captain, but we were never able to get any pay increase for officers above that grade. I have long felt that this is a badly needed piece of legislation, and that we have long deferred simple justice to a great many of our most able public servants, those who administer the affairs and look after the business of our armed services. Personally, I wish to express my pleasure at having this legislation finally brought

thus far along the road toward successful enactment.

Mr. President, I have long been very much interested in the affairs of the Reserve components of our armed services. I know something of the struggle we have had through the years in trying to build up a proper incentive for our Reserve components, in order to maintain them as a vigorous force in peacetime. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky will agree with me that had we not had the Reserve personnel which we had when we became involved in the last war we would have been greatly set back from where we found ourselves. The Reserve personnel did a wonderful job during that war.

With that in mind, I have been very much attracted by the two amendments proposed by the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] relating to certain safeguards affecting Reserve components which he apparently feels should be written into the bill. I hope that while the Senator is discussing the bill he will tell us something with reference to whether or not those amendments are needed, or whether such safeguards are already carried in the bill. I think they are matters which certainly ought to be a part of our policy and practice. If needed in the legislation, such amendments ought to be written in affirmatively.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the able Senator from Alabama for his statement, to which we have just listened with much interest. He is certainly well qualified to discuss this subject. Well do I remember his outstanding work as a member of the Military Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives in getting through that body the pay bill of 1946, to which further reference will be made during my discussion of the pending bill.

I have always, as has the Senator from Alabama, been deeply interested in promoting the training and welfare of the civilian components of the Army, and I am sure that when the discussion is over, and before the bill is passed, the Senator will agree that the bill deals fairly with all branches of the service. I shall be glad to discuss that subject, and I believe that before we reach the point of consideration of the amendments on Monday it will be possible for us to agree on an amendment covering the subject matter to which he has referred, namely, the subject matter of the amendments proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

#### PRESENT SYSTEM UNSOUND

Such a system as we have been discussing was looked upon by the Hook Commission as being thoroughly unsound in principle. No member of the uniformed forces should constantly accumulate in-grade increases if he proves incapable of qualifying for promotion. The professional or lifetime private, or private first class, or corporal, or junior officer who serves for 30 years without qualifying for promotion is, according to the best military authorities, of very doubtful value to the services. For this reason, insofar as in-grade increases are



concerned the pay scales which are shown on page 9 of the bill tend to level off after a reasonable period of service has expired. For example, it will be noted that enlisted grade E-2, which is that of private, begins at \$82.50, rises gradually to \$112.50 upon the expiration of 8 years' service and levels off at \$120 at the end of 10 years' service. Under present career expectancy the average private will have had repeated opportunities to reach a higher grade long before he has completed even as much as 2 years of service. If he fails to attain a promotion after the completion of 10 years, he is so very inferior to the normal career pattern that it is unwise to continue giving him a pay raise every 3 years for the rest of his service. The same applies to warrant officers and officers. The basic concept of the pay scales which are recommended in this bill demands that increases of pay shall go to those who carry increased responsibilities, and shall not accrue to the individual who is content to forego promotion opportunities and thereby avoid added responsibility. This principle should also eliminate such obvious inconsistencies in present procedures as permit a commander of 30 years' service to receive the same pay as a rear admiral—lower half—having the same period of service. That occurs frequently in our armed services. Insofar as the Army is concerned, the result of this astonishing quirk in the present law is that for every brigadier general there are 10 officers either one or two grades below him who draw the same pay that a brigadier general draws.

That is what has often occurred under this antiquated and outmoded system which has had no general overhauling since 1908.

#### CHANGES IN PHYSICAL DISABILITY RETIREMENT PROCEDURES

The second major change proposed by this bill has to do with retirements for physical disability. For a great many years it has been the practice in the uniformed services to retire an officer when he is found physically incapable of active service. Retirement practices did not extend to the enlisted grades as a whole. An officer, upon retirement, was given retirement pay equal to 75 percent of his active duty base and longevity pay. My recollection is that that became the law in 1862. After the surrender of Fort Sumter and after the Battle of First Manassas, a few miles from Washington, it was found that there were in the United States Army men holding commissions as captains, and supposed to be in active service in the war, who had passed the age of 70. Such conditions led to the Retirement Act of 1862, and it has been the law ever since. No differentiation was made between the various actual degrees of disability, so long as the disability in fact constituted an incapacity for further active military service. Such an individual was retired, and was entitled to retirement compensation based upon three-fourths of his active-duty pay. The proposed legislation makes a fundamental change, in that it would relate the amount of compensation to the degree of disability. Furthermore, it would establish an incapacity of 30 percent by Vet-

erans' Administration standards as the minimum which could qualify the individual for retirement. A lesser degree of disability would be compensated by the granting of lump-sum "severance pay," instead of long-term retirement pay. Finally, the principle of retirement for physical disability is extended to the enlisted grades on the same relative basis as it is applied to the commissioned grades, and a 5-year "temporary retired list" is established to insure that only permanent disabilities are compensated on a permanent basis. The severance pay to which I refer—for one having less than 30 percent of disability—would be calculated on the basis of 2 months' pay, multiplied by the number of years of active service. In other words, if a man had 5 years of active service, his pay for 2 months would be multiplied by 5, and that would be the lump-sum amount of his pay—in that case, for 10 months. In no case would the total exceed 2 years.

#### PROVIDING QUARTERS ALLOWANCE IN LIEU OF WARTIME FAMILY ALLOWANCES

The third major change relates to the granting of a money allowance for quarters, in lieu of the so-called family allowance provided pursuant to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942. The 1942 statute was temporary wartime legislation, which expires upon the termination of the present emergency, as prescribed by the Congress.

During periods of total mobilization, such as occurred during our most recent war, it is necessary to induct into the armed forces numerous individuals who have family responsibilities which are far beyond the military pay scale. The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 authorized the payment of money allowances based upon the number of dependents. These allowances were paid directly to the dependents, rather than to the individual serviceman. Such a procedure is obviously necessary under conditions of full wartime mobilization, but is far too expensive for the permanent peacetime establishment. For that reason the bill provides for a gradual replacement of the family-allowance program with a permanent-quarters allowance payable only to enlisted personnel of the higher grades. A tabulation of these allowances is shown on page 27 of the bill, and is discussed in detail beginning at the bottom of page 20 of the committee report.

#### COST ESTIMATES

The cost of this bill to the Government will level off at approximately \$304,000,000 annually. For the fiscal year 1950, assuming that the bill becomes effective on October 1, 1949, the cost will be \$274,000,000. For the fiscal year 1951, it will be approximately \$348,000,000, decreasing until 1953, when it will level off at \$304,000,000, based, of course, on the present numerical strength of the armed forces.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator advised the Senate of the last time when a military pay raise bill was passed by the

Congress? Will the Senator give us that information?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes. The last one which was passed was in 1946, but, as stated earlier in this discussion, the last general revision applying to the entire pay pattern was in 1908.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the year I remembered.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Yes; that is correct. It has been 41 years since there has been any general overhauling of the entire compensation plan.

Mr. LUCAS. It seems to me it is long past due.

Mr. CHAPMAN. It certainly is. The present system is outmoded and antiquated. All the other amendments to the law since 1908 have been just a little patchwork here and there, leaving a veritable hodgepodge or crazy-quilt effect.

#### NO BUDGET INCREASE

Mr. President, this measure will not involve any additional budgetary appropriations, because the President of the United States in his budget estimates proposed that there be set aside \$400,000,000 for this purpose. In the next fiscal year, as I have just pointed out, the cost of this bill, if enacted, will be only \$274,000,000; and when the cost levels off in 1953 it will be \$304,000,000 annually—all less than the President's budget.

The variation in cost is due to the effect of gradually reducing family-allowance payments until their final termination on July 1, 1952. During that period appropriations for both pay and quarters allowances for enlisted men will show an increase. This situation results from the fact that some enlisted personnel will receive their present pay plus family allowances either for the duration of their enlistment or until they receive a promotion, at which time they will shift to the new pay and quarters allowance.

I should point out, of course, that the preceding cost estimates are based upon present personnel strength. If the size of the present establishment is decreased, the cost will go down; if the size is increased, the cost will go up.

A more detailed analysis which shows the distribution of the major costs of the bill, as well as the cost reductions, appears in the committee report beginning near the bottom of page 3 and running to the top of page 5.

There has been some discussion of the fact that the income-tax exemption for service personnel was terminated effective January 1, 1949. Previously there was an exemption of \$1,500 for commissioned officers, with total exemption for enlisted personnel. I do not claim the Congress has not acted in perfectly good faith in eliminating the income-tax exemption for service personnel. It was intended solely as a war measure, but it cannot be successfully disputed that its elimination in this period of high living costs has had serious impact on the budget of the average serviceman, and that countless thousands of service personnel have felt keenly and severely the diminution in the amount of their so-called take-home pay. The net result is that, because of the elimination of the income-tax exemption, the Federal Government

takes back, in the form of income taxes for 1949, an additional \$130,000,000 from military pay. With the adoption of the new pay scales provided in the pending bill, the tax recovery by the Government will be increased \$85,000,000, making a total of \$195,000,000 which the Treasury will receive next year from servicemen's incomes that did not go into the Treasury last year.

#### OTHER WARTIME LEGISLATION

I think it is appropriate to mention at this point two other pieces of temporary wartime legislation in addition to the elimination of the income-tax exemption, which make it desirable that a prompt revision of the existing pay scales be considered. The system of bonuses for overseas duty in the Army and Air Force, and sea duty in the Navy, needs reexamination in the light of present conditions. During the war, officers were paid a 10 percent bonus for duty at sea or overseas, enlisted men a bonus of 20 percent. This is a very substantial sum, with approximately half of our personnel qualifying, as they do today, under the present bonus system, because approximately half of those in the armed services are now either on the sea or overseas.

Overseas pay was a wartime measure, intended to compensate personnel for the fact that wartime duty outside the continental United States was both hazardous and rugged. At the present time, however, situations in our overseas theaters have changed for the better to a marked extent. In many instances, life overseas is very pleasant indeed; and even sea duty is far less arduous than during hostilities. As a consequence of this change in conditions, it is both appropriate and essential that our very expensive system of wartime overseas bonuses be examined in the light of the more temperate atmosphere in which we are now living. We do not know, though, Mr. President, what change might take place in that atmosphere in the future. We have been engaged in what is referred to generally as a cold war, and our most earnest hope and our most fervent prayer is it may not change into a hot war.

Finally, our \$314,000,000 annual bill for family allowances paid under the wartime Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act needs to be readjusted to peacetime conditions. It has always been the policy—and rightfully so—in our permanent peacetime Military Establishment to select incoming enlisted personnel from among those who have no dependent families. By and large, the incoming recruits for the Regular service average well under 20 years of age, and are unmarried. It has been the custom not to provide married quarters or allowances to the Regular personnel until they have been in the service a sufficient length of time to indicate that they intend to make a career of it. Therefore, only the upper enlisted grades are normally provided with family quarters in the peacetime establishment. But during periods of full mobilization brought about by war the situation is entirely different. Men are inducted into the armed services at ages up to 45 years.

Many of these men have obligations and family responsibilities which are far beyond their pay as privates in the Army. The same statement of course applies to equivalent grades in the Navy. It is therefore essential in times of full mobilization that the dependents of servicemen be given an allowance to compensate for the decreased earning power of the head of the family. These wartime allowances are in no sense a part of the servicemen's pay; they are merely a necessary contribution from the Federal Government to avoid hardship. However, now that the hostilities have ended, and only persons having no dependents are being taken into the services in the lower grades, it is essential that the family allowance be gradually phased out of existence, and replaced by a quarters allowance which is related to the ability and responsibility of the serviceman rather than merely to the size of his family. In wartime it is essential to pay some privates well over \$200 per month because of their family responsibilities; but in the permanent peacetime establishment we must gradually convert to a more realistic basis which relates pay to responsibility. Also, there is no way absolutely to control the present family allowance plan and to protect the Treasury of the United States.

Before leaving this subject, I should like to discuss—

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky has told us what the bill will cost in the future. Will the Senator tell us how the future cost will compare with the cost of the same Military Establishment in terms of numbers today?

Mr. CHAPMAN. That cost, estimated for the future, is based on a Military Establishment of the same size as that which we now have.

Mr. CAIN. If, therefore, in the future the increased cost of our Military Establishment, in terms of allowances and pay, and so forth, will be roughly \$300,000,000, what is it costing us today?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It means that it will cost \$304,000,000 more than it is costing us today.

Mr. CAIN. More?

Mr. CHAPMAN. That is correct; and the budget estimate for this purpose was \$400,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask how much money the Treasury will take in, in the future, by reason of the elimination of the income-tax exemption?

Mr. CHAPMAN. As a result of the elimination of the exemption, the Government now collects on present pay scales an additional \$130,000,000. The additional income tax collected by the Treasury on the increased pay provided in the pending bill will be \$65,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. That is what I am trying to ascertain.

Mr. CHAPMAN. The net increase to the Treasury will amount to \$195,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. The pay bill is not an outright increase of \$304,000,000, is it?

Mr. CHAPMAN. No; for fiscal year 1950 it is the difference between \$270,000,000 and \$195,000,000, which would be \$75,000,000 actual outright additional cost this year.

Mr. CAIN. I think Senators and other citizens will be exceedingly interested in the return to the Government as the result of the income-tax elimination.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I thank the Senator for the observation.

On page 8 of the committee report, we find this statement:

It is pertinent to indicate at this point that beginning with January 1949, due to the elimination of the \$1,500 income-tax exemption—

And elimination of all exemptions, of course, to enlisted men—

the Federal Government will take back in the form of personal-income taxes an additional \$130,000,000 from military pay. With the new rates provided in this bill this amount will be increased by \$65,000,000, to a total of \$195,000,000. If this increase in tax revenue is measured against the \$302,000,000 increase in the amount paid out, it will be seen that the increased drain on the Federal Treasury is approximately \$107,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has satisfied my interest, for which I am grateful.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I thank the able Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, before leaving this subject, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the very serious dilemma in which the armed services find themselves with respect to this wartime family-allowance program.

If the present program were to be abruptly terminated, the bulk of our enlisted personnel would suffer a hardship which would be nothing short of ruinous, unless such termination carried with it some form of quarters' allowance such as is proposed in this bill. Hence, we are forced to maintain this wartime program simply because we have not enacted its peacetime counterpart.

#### TITLE BY TITLE EXPLANATION

It might be helpful for me to attempt, at this point, to make a brief explanation of each of the five titles of the bill. I should also like to mention the fact that the committee report contains a detailed explanation of each subsection of the bill. This begins on page 14 of the report and extends to the end, on page 37.

Title I contains a series of definitions which are necessary for a clear and exact interpretation of the other four titles. These definitions conform to existing law, and I cannot at the moment think of any important change which requires special comment.

Title II, which begins on page 8 of the bill, contains the provisions which fix the scales of basic pay, as well as incentive or so-called hazard pay and the various special pays, such as reenlistment bonuses.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.



Mr. CAIN. What percentage of the cost of this bill is represented by the so-called hazard or incentive and special pay?

Mr. CHAPMAN. If this bill shall become law, the Government will make an annual saving on those types of pay amounting to \$13,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. Do I correctly understand that we are reducing hazard and special pay by approximately \$13,000,000?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Senator from Kentucky will attempt to explain that in detail.

Mr. CAIN. I shall appreciate the Senator's explanation of it.

Mr. CHAPMAN. If I may continue, this title permits a definite break from the heterogeneous and outmoded groups of laws which have grown up over the past 40 years to govern military pay, under the system which has been in effect since the enactment of the present law in 1908.

Furthermore, the recommended scales establish a pattern which is geared to the military career as a whole, rather than simply to one small segment of it. In providing a carefully worked out pay pattern, the bill also makes it possible for the pay roll to be adjusted upward or downward to meet changing economic conditions by simply applying a percentage figure rather than by resorting to a complicated revision of a dozen or more laws.

As I have stated before, this bill does away with the present base and longevity pay and substitutes what is termed "basic pay." The scale of monthly basic pay is shown on page 9 of the bill and is discussed in detail beginning at the bottom of page 15 of the report. I would also invite attention to the table beginning on page 9 of the report, which shows the present basic compensation in dollars per month for all officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men, and the table on page 11, which shows the same information based upon the scales proposed in the pending bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is a very technical bill. If a Member of the Senate wanted to get a true picture of the situation in a quick form, he should look at the tables on pages 9 and 11. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Senator is exactly correct. I should like to commend to Senators who would like to have a detailed explanation and comparison of those tables that they read the report. It is very definite and specific, covering the entire subject under discussion.

We have also prepared a series of three illustrative tables, beginning on page 5 of the report, which compare present and proposed scales of basic pay, basic pay and allowances, basic-pay allowances, and flight pay.

I am sure my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts will join with me in recommending that Senators look at those tables also, because they are very informative on this subject.

We feel that the table on page 6 is particularly useful, in that it shows what might be called the take-home effect of the bill as it will apply to the great majority of our service men and women.

#### A NEW BASIS FOR FLYING PAY

In regard to incentive pay for flying and submarine duty, it will be noted that the old rule of granting a 50 percent increase for these types of duty has been changed in favor of a flat monthly rate, which is shown on page 19 of the bill, and discussed on page 18 of the report. A comparison of the actual effect of the old scale and the new, as applied to representative officer and enlisted grades, appears in the table on page 7 of the report.

#### SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY AT SEA OR OVERSEAS

At the present time officers and warrant officers continue to draw the wartime allowance of 10 percent extra pay for duty at sea or overseas, enlisted personnel 20 percent. As I have mentioned previously, the overseas bonus for officers and warrant officers has been eliminated, and that of enlisted personnel placed on a flat monthly rate. These rates for the seven enlisted grades are shown on page 22 of the bill.

#### REENLISTMENT BONUS

The present law permits a reenlistment bonus of \$50 for each year of active service in the enlistment just expired, and is payable upon reenlistment. The proposed scales are on a graduated basis, beginning at \$20 per year for a 2-year enlistment, and running to \$60 per year for a 6-year enlistment. Also these are to be paid in advance, rather than upon the expiration of the enlistment period, and a lifetime ceiling of four bonuses and a total of \$1,440 is provided. This plan is regarded as having particular merit, and is explained in detail beginning on page 19 of the report.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky what the substantial arguments are in favor of flight pay, referred to as being either hazard or incentive pay, for flag and general officers? I ask this question without any prejudice whatsoever to the officers holding such ranks, but I am confused when we talk about flight pay as being incentive or hazard pay, when it seems logical that flag and general officers have less to do with airplanes, for obvious reasons, than do field grades, junior grades, and non-commissioned and private personnel.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for that question, and I shall be glad to endeavor to answer it and to give him my personal thought on the subject in connection with the consideration it had in the committee.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR INCENTIVE PAY FOR FLYING

I am convinced that incentive pay, or flying pay, is essential to keep up the morale of our flyers, to maintain the proper kind of personnel, and, particularly, to train the leaders of the future.

Military flying is increasingly hazardous as compared with commercial aviation. Passenger fatalities in commercial

aviation during 1946 were only one-sixth of the fatality rate in 1936, yet 6 military pilots were killed in military aviation in 1946 to one civilian pilot. The postwar pilot deaths have increased 25 percent over prewar fatalities, based on the number of deaths per thousand pilots per year.

Maximum combat capability, not safety, must be the primary objective in the development of military aircraft. As a consequence, although we are trying to increase safety, our military requirements—the combat capability feature—keep undoing these efforts. Aircraft with the highest combat performance generally are the most dangerous to fly. Military aircraft must operate under extreme conditions of altitude, speed, and weather.

In fact, the very training a military pilot gets is geared to train him to handle himself in speedy planes at high altitudes and in all kinds of rough weather. Nonscheduled off-airway flying is far more dangerous than flying commercial routes. Dive-bombing, strafing, and other training activities increase the hazards of military flying. The death rate of military pilots in aircraft accidents is three times that of commercial air line pilots employed full time on scheduled flying. The annual aircraft accident rate for the Air Force pilots since the war is 12 per thousand. The death rate of commercial pilots employed full time on scheduled flying is about 4 per thousand.

With jet planes and rocket planes, the dangers to military pilots are increasing continually. With planes flying at supersonic speeds, picture the difficulty and the hazard in the event the engine fails, or something goes wrong, requiring the pilot to either land the plane or bail out.

Military flying even in peacetime is hazardous as compared with other occupations. I need not go into that in detail except to say that the death rate of flying personnel is slightly over five times the death rate in the Ground Forces, or that part of the Air Force devoting their entire time on the ground.

Although aircraft accident rates have decreased due to a vigorous safety program, the death hazard to the individual flyer actually has increased. His exposure to flying hazards has increased because he is required to fly more hours per year in order to retain a military pilot's rating, and because modern combat equipment and tactics have decreased the safety factor.

A pilot's span of life is 12 years less than the nonflyer's. That means that two young men starting out in military life, one a military pilot and the other a ground officer, have a difference of 12 years in favor of the man who remains on the ground. One out of every four military pilots starting at the age of 22 will be dead by the time he is 40. The nonpilots will not suffer this attrition until the age of 61. In addition to the death hazard, flying personnel often suffer permanent ill effects from physical stress of flying under extreme conditions. These statements are all based on actuarial studies.

Also, military flying is hazardous in wartime as compared with other military duties. Over two-thirds of the Army officers killed in combat during wartime were Air Corps flying officers. As you know, the Air Forces were part of the Army during the World War. Of the 34,645 Army officer combat fatalities during World War II, 24,119 were Air Corps flying officers; more than half of the other casualties, which included all kinds of injuries, in the entire Army were Air Corps flying personnel; more than three-fourths of the officers captured or interned by the enemy were Air Corps flying officers. In addition to the combat fatalities, 16,313 Air Corps flying personnel were killed in noncombat aircraft accidents during World War II. The fatality rate due to noncombat aircraft accidents alone was 15.7 per thousand persons per year. The fatality among nonflying personnel in the Army due to all noncombat causes was 2.4 per thousand persons per year.

Another very important factor to consider in offering incentive pay to flyers is that not only the flyer himself, but his family, as well, is subjected to stresses and strains and worries related to this specialized occupation.

Something has occurred only recently which I am sure the distinguished Senator from Washington has noticed in the newspapers, in connection with the recent hurricanes which developed in the Caribbean Sea and advanced toward the coast of Florida. At least one of them wrought terrific damage. The commercial flyer, the man who flies the air lines, tries to keep away from the paths of such hurricanes, but the flyer in the service is directed to go there and trace down the hurricane, and return and make report. He has hazards which cannot be compared with those of commercial pilots.

#### SENIOR OFFICERS MUST BE ACTIVE PILOTS

Senior officers, as well as their juniors, must be active pilots. The men who plan Air Force combat missions, the men who are called upon to direct the execution of these missions, must have the viewpoint of the pilot or the copilot sitting in the plane, or a member of the crew, to handle properly his assignment as director of air activities. He cannot be a real leader, nor thoroughly understand what is involved in air operations, unless he has had flying experience himself. The quality of our air arm will be determined by the caliber of its leadership.

If the senior officers are to make decisions on which the lives of flight personnel and the success of their missions will depend, they must be active flyers. They must not lose their grasp, nor be merely synthetic aviators. Our very security may depend upon the direction they give to our air offensive. Success and life, or failure, is in their hands.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to have opportunity to pay the Senator from Kentucky a compliment, by saying that he has just given to me the most comprehensive answer to a question I have ever

been privileged to receive in this body. I have learned much from what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has said.

I have but one other brief question. Will the Senator advise us what number of hours must be flown each month or each year in order to qualify a general officer or a flag officer for the flight pay which is presently under discussion?

Mr. CHAPMAN. One hundred hours a year.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I thank the Senator for his question. I should like, for the RECORD, to make a little further answer.

I should like to point out one thing that concerns the future. Our enemies in World War II failed to realize this vital factor of having real air leadership, men who from actual experience and training understood air combat and air warfare. Serious mistakes made by leaders of the German and Japanese Air Forces were contributing factors in our outstanding success, and their dismal failure. Those mistakes were due to the fact that they did not have intimate personal knowledge of the capabilities and limitations of the air weapon which they were responsible for using.

In conclusion, we have studied the problem of flying pay with care, and initially with some skepticism. We feel that the proposition is sound, is justified by facts, and that our recommendations have complete merit.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Would it be safe to say to the American people generally—for many of them have their own doubts, and possess some skepticism—that there is no likelihood, as a result of the passage of the pending bill, that desk officers in any considerable number, so to speak, will benefit in the future from flight pay? I think that is a question which is in the minds of many people, and I should like as best I can to get the viewpoint of the committee for the consideration of myself and others.

Mr. CHAPMAN. There has been a material and substantial cut-back for general and flag officers, and I believe the committee, and I am sure those with whom I have discussed the question, are certain of their position, and feel fully justified in giving to the American people that assurance.

Mr. CAIN. I am extremely grateful, for myself and others, for that answer.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I thank the Senator from Washington.

#### TITLE III—PROVISIONS RELATING TO ALLOWANCES

Mr. President, this title pertains to the various allowances, which are in addition to any pay which the individual receives.

A basic allowance for subsistence is authorized by section 301 and a basic allowance for quarters by section 302. These allowances conform to the recommendations made by the Hook Commission. The subsistence allowance for officers is at the rate of \$42 per month, and differs from present law in that an increased subsistence allowance is not pro-

vided for officers having dependents. As regards the basic allowance for quarters, a rather fundamental difference from existing law will be noted in the table which appears on page 27 of the bill. In the past, an increased quarters allowance has been authorized for all officers having dependents; but in the case of enlisted persons, an additional quarters allowance was authorized only to a limited extent, to enlisted men of the three higher grades, and then only when they had dependents. This bill extends to the highest four enlisted pay grades a monthly quarters allowance of \$67.50 in cases where there are dependents, and \$45 where there are no dependents.

The maximum per diem allowance has been increased from \$7 to \$9; the maximum mileage allowance from 8 to 10 cents per mile, and the maximum allowance in lieu of transportation has been increased from 5 to 7 cents per mile. These changes bring the uniformed services into agreement with the other Government agencies in this connection, and for the first time apply to enlisted grades on the same basis as to officers.

#### TITLE IV—A REVISION OF PRESENT PHYSICAL DISABILITY RETIREMENT LAWS

As has been stated before, title IV of this bill proposes a long-overdue modernization of physical disability retirement procedures in the uniformed services. In my opinion, there are four specific provisions which are worthy of special comment.

This over-all modernization is an innovation which, I feel sure, will be welcome and one which, in the judgment of the committee, is fully justified.

#### DISABILITY RETIREMENT EXTENDED TO ENLISTED PERSONNEL

In the first place, disability retirement is extended to enlisted personnel on the same basis as to officers. Heretofore, an enlisted man could not be retired for physical disability unless he had completed 20 years of service. Those having less than that period of service were simply discharged on a certificate of disability, following which they applied to the Veterans' Administration for compensation. The proposed bill will permit the disabled enlisted man to be retired according to the same criteria as apply to the commissioned officer.

Based on nearly 25 years of experience as a Member of the Congress, I can say that my observation has led me to the conclusion that a very small percentage of those who had been discharged from service in the armed forces with a certificate of disability were ever able to receive any benefits under the veterans' law, because, no matter what the cause was, it was virtually impossible, in most cases, to prove service connection under those circumstances.

#### A TEMPORARY RETIRED LIST IS PROVIDED

In order for an individual to be permanently retired, it must be established that his disability is actually a permanent one. Very frequently this determination entails a fairly lengthy period of observation. In the meantime, it is improvident from the point of view of the Government to retain the individual on an active-duty status at full pay; on the



other hand, it is unfair to the individual to separate him from the service without definitely clarifying his status. To meet this situation, the bill provides that an individual shall be placed initially on a temporary retired list, and shall be re-examined not less than once every 18 months for a period of not to exceed 5 years. At the end of that time—or sooner, if the facts warrant—the individual is either retired, or is returned to his prior active-duty status. During this transition period he is entitled to retirement pay, which shall not be less than 50 percent of his active-duty pay. This 50-percent minimum applies only to time spent on the temporary list.

#### RETIREMENT PAY IS RELATED TO THE DEGREE OF DISABILITY

Under the bill the individual receives retirement pay based upon the percentage of his disability, but it cannot exceed 75 percent of his basic pay. A disability of 30 percent, measured according to Veterans' Administration standards, is the minimum which will qualify the individual for retirement. Beginning with this minimum, the degree of disability may be graduated upward in multiples of 10—that is, 40, 50, 60, and so on. Accordingly, an individual with a 40-percent disability receives compensation equal to 40 percent of his active duty basic pay, instead of 75 percent as at present, based on what officers were granted in the old act of 1862. In those cases where an individual is physically disabled for active duty, but the degree of disability is less than 30 percent, a lump-sum severance pay in an amount related to length of service is provided, which, as I stated earlier in the discussion, amounts to 2 months' pay, multiplied by the number of years of service, with a maximum of 24 months of pay, to be given as a lump sum.

#### DISABILITY ARISING FROM JOB HAZARD IS DIFFERENT FROM NONOCCUPATIONAL HAZARD

This bill introduces the principle of different treatment for disability arising from hazards of the job and disability arising from other causes. If the individual, whether he be a Regular or a non-Regular, has had less than 8 years of service, the disability must be "the proximate result of the performance of active duty," whereas if he has had more than 8 years of service, he may qualify for retirement following a nonoccupational disability, provided, of course, that it was not the result of his own misconduct.

#### SAVING CLAUSE FOR PERSONS HERETOFORE RETIRED

Section 411 of the bill provides that persons heretofore retired shall not suffer a reduction in their present retirement pay. They may, however, avail themselves of the new pay scales if they can qualify under the more exacting criteria established by the terms of the bill. They can seek to benefit by the provisions of the new law, but they are assured against losing what they already have.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he continues?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Possibly the Senator has already covered the question I am about to ask, but if so, perhaps for the sake of emphasis, it should be repeated. Is it not true that the bill merely concerns physical disability retirement, and that it does not in any way, shape, form, or manner deal with a retirement for nondisability reasons? That was considered, was it not, to be too technical a subject, which needed further study? Am I not correct?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Senator is entirely correct. That subject does require further careful study. To have included in the bill retirement for reasons other than physical disability would have had no budgetary impact, but retirement for physical disability does have very serious and important budgetary impact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is also true, as I know the Senator has emphasized, that this measure, for the first time, places the enlisted man and the officer on the same basis for physical disability retirement.

Mr. CHAPMAN. That is correct. I believe the Committees on Armed Services and all of their members have a feeling of justifiable pride in having accomplished that result in both Houses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, that for the first 5 years in physical disability cases a man is put on a temporary basis, and that he is not permanently retired on any permanent basis until after 5 years, so that that gives him the best possible advantage?

Mr. CHAPMAN. The Senator is entirely correct, and I thank him for his very valuable contribution.

#### TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS AND REPEALERS

Title V consists of 33 sections, most of which contain the usual routine of repealers and other technical changes incident to the new terminology contained in the bill. Three of these sections merit special comment in this brief summary of the terms of the bill.

Section 511 deals with the pay of persons heretofore retired for reasons other than disability. It permits them to continue to receive their present retirement pay, or to elect instead an amount obtained by using the new scales and computing on the basis of 2½ percent per year of service. Both the House committee and the Senate committee were importuned by representatives of a group of nondisability retired officers to change this section so that any officer heretofore retired for nondisability and currently being paid 75 percent of his active pay, should continue on that basis and at the new scales. Both committees rejected this proposal. If such a proposition were agreed to for one group, it would be impossible for the Congress not to grant this very substantial reward to all groups. The request was originally sponsored by a group of several hundred Regular Army officers who were retired for reasons other than physical disability, but were given 75 per-

cent of their active-duty pay regardless of whether they had completed 30 years of service. Actually, there are 614 of those officers involved, and the annual cost of their proposal would be nearly \$700,000. To permit this group to apply the 75 percent factor to the new scales would virtually obligate the Congress to grant this privilege to the thousands of disability retirements, who actually have a much more persuasive argument and a much more forceful claim than do the 614 officers, who several years ago were retired for reasons other than physical disability. And if it were applied to the officers, there is no conceivable reason for not applying it to enlisted men, with the result that a very serious increase in cost would ensue.

Section 515 contains provisions designed to protect all persons on active duty from suffering any decrease in compensation as a result of the provisions of this bill prior to July 1, 1952. This section also contains the provisions for phasing out the present family-allowance payments in a reasonable and gradual manner, so as to prevent any hardship for persons currently receiving such payments. In effect, the section provides that there shall be no loss of total compensation, including family allowances now being paid, for a period of 6 months. At the end of that period, certain of the allowances for brothers and sisters and parents begin to terminate, and by 1952 all allowances will have been supplanted by the new quarters allowance provided for in the bill.

Section 533, the last section of the bill, provides that the effective date shall be October 1, 1949.

#### IS A PAY INCREASE NECESSARY?

I have purposely delayed until this point in my remarks any specific comment as to whether an actual increase in the rates of pay themselves is warranted. I believe all of us will agree that the old system needs a complete overhauling and is badly in need of revision. But should the actual amount of pay be increased?

The Hook Commission examined this aspect of the problem in detail. In undertaking its research that group did not begin with a premise that the need for more pay was a foregone conclusion. Rather, they first made a complete analysis of the pay scales which prevail in industry for positions of comparable responsibility and skill to those in the services. They carried out exhaustive studies of the job requirements as they exist in the services today, and then compared them with job requirements in civil life. They took into full account the retirement plans offered by the Government, as well as the advantages of medical care and other factors which are peculiar to the uniformed establishments. They also considered the special demands which duty in the uniformed forces impose upon the individual. After this completely objective analysis, they compared the pay scales which prevail in industry with the adjusted average pay pattern now prevalent in the uniformed services for positions demanding comparable skill or responsibility.

Based upon the specific results of this analysis, they unanimously recommended a pay scale which they felt was necessary to attract personnel having the qualifications needed by the services if they are to fulfill their responsibilities. That is the scale which they proposed, and that is the scale presented in the pending bill, except for a reduction of 5 percent for officers, 3 percent for warrant officers, and 2 percent for enlisted men which the bill makes below the Hook recommendations. The House originally made those reductions in the Hook pattern, not because they felt that the original Hook proposals were overly generous, but to meet the budgetary ceiling which they felt it was necessary to impose. The Senate Committee on Armed Services concurred with this action on the part of the House, except that the 10-percent reduction for flag and general officers which appears in the House bill was reduced to 5 percent. The Hook Commission recommended this change in the House version, and the Senate committee concurs in that recommendation.

The validity of the Hook findings that military pay rates are substantially below those prevailing in comparable positions in industry is borne out by the serious difficulties which the services experience in securing, and in keeping, qualified personnel. The rate of resignation among officers is at an all-time high. Only a negligible number of ROTC graduates to whom commissions in the regular services are offered are accepting, whereas in past years the supply of good men actually exceeded the needs of the services.

Speaking from personal experience, prior to 1932 there were 12 counties in the congressional district which I represented. From 1932 until I became a Member of this body on January 3 of this year there were 17 counties in the congressional district which I represented. My personal experience is that, leaving out the war years, I had more applications for appointments to Annapolis and West Point, both from the 12-county district which I first represented and from the 17-county district which I later represented, than I have received as a representative of the 120 counties in the Commonwealth of Kentucky this year. I think that is a significant fact. I do not know what the experience of other Senators has been, but I have heard some say that they have had a similar experience. There are fewer applications now for cadetships and appointments as midshipmen than there were in the prewar peacetime years.

As regards enlisted personnel, reenlistment rates approximate only about 30 percent, as against a prewar figure of 51 percent for the Army and Air Force and 81 percent for the Navy. This decline in reenlistments results in a turn-over which is so serious that at the present time 15 percent of the strength of the armed forces is dissipated in recruiting and recruit training. Many of our more responsible leaders, both civilian and military, have expressed their deep concern over the impairment in the morale of our forces which the present inadequate pay scales are causing. The offi-

cers and men in uniform have seen all groups in civil life receive repeated increases in pay over the past 10 years. They are as acutely affected by the rise in the cost of living as any one of us is. Yet, in the face of this set of circumstances, they have suffered an actual decrease in pay, brought about by a chain of events over which they have had no control, and in which they could express no voice. These loyal, stalwart men and women have no right of collective bargaining. They cannot demand relief. They could not strike if they would. They would not strike if they could. They could not, if they would, engage in a slowdown in their vitally important task of insuring their country's national security; and they would not if they could. In the meantime, we demand of them the highest standards in the execution of their functions and their performance of duty. They, in turn, are completely dependent upon us for accurate fact finding as to their legitimate and reasonable requirements, and for appropriate action based upon these facts. This fact finding has been under way for 4 years. It culminated in the findings of the civilian Hook Commission, and the approval of those findings by the House of Representatives in the form of the pending bill. The Senate Committee on Armed Services has re-examined the entire proposition in detail, and recommends that H. R. 5007 be passed.

#### THIS BILL DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE

Mr. President, there has been in some sections of the press of the country, and in other places, expression of the unsubstantiated and unsupported charge, that this is a bill for the brass, as it has sometimes been expressed. The committee is fully cognizant of the criticism, which originally was expressed on the floor of the House of Representatives, that the first Kilday bill in the House of Representatives did not do enough for the enlisted men. As all Senators are aware, that original bill was recommitted to the House Armed Services Committee; and the pending bill, House bill 5007, was substituted for it. House bill 5007 passed the House of Representatives by voice vote.

The committee holds to the view that the contention that this is a bill which favors the officers at the expense of the enlisted man is completely erroneous. This can be demonstrated in the very outset by simply pointing out that the recommended scales based upon a career of 25 years of military service provide advantages for officers and enlisted men which are within three-tenths of 1 percent of being identical.

Before I discuss this matter further, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a letter which was written to the Secretary of Defense by General Eisenhower, and which appears at the bottom of page 35 of the committee hearings:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just learned that the question of revision of service pay is again up for discussion. It occurs to me that I have not, in prior communication or conversation, laid before you my views on this matter which are deep-seated and most emphatic.

There is no element in the Army so important as its leadership, and by this expression I do not refer solely to the highest commander, or even merely to the general officers and colonels. I mean the entire framework of trained men who are responsible for the implementation of the commander's decision, both in the actual crisis of battle itself and in the long process of mobilization, training, and preparation that leads up to battle. The fate of our country has time and again rested in the hands of the officers of its armed forces.

The importance of the leaders has increased with every scientific and technical advance that has made warfare more complicated, more difficult, and more total in character. I firmly believe that at no place else in the world are exemplary qualities of leadership so necessary to success as they are in the modern infantry battle waged with every type and kind of weapon and under conditions where only the skill and ability of commanders, noncommissioned and commissioned, can bring about that concert of action that is absolutely essential to victory.

Our country is making great sacrifices in money and materials to provide a reasonable assurance of security against the possibility of aggression. Unless adequate military leadership is included in these provisions, all these sacrifices, all these expenditures will be futile. Skilled military leadership is the indispensable ingredient to victory. We must insist that the quality of the individual, if selected for entry into the commissioned rank of the armed services, is of the highest. To do this we must provide reasonable incentive.

The present pay and allowance scales of our armed forces are far too small to permit men of ability to serve in noncommissioned and commissioned grades with self-respect and with human regard for their obligations to their families and to themselves. These pay scales are stupidly inadequate—corrective action must be taken without delay or we shall reach the bitter consequences of secondary leadership. Our sons and grandsons deserve better than this—they, if called to the defense of our country, deserve the leadership of able and capable Americans. Our countrymen have died in every corner of the globe, on the land, on the sea, and in the air, to assure that this Nation shall continue to exist as a free republic in which is recognized the essential dignity of the individual. Americans, if faced by aggressive threat in the future, will be equally ready to die, but all those deaths of the past and of the future will be futile unless the organized military forces in which future Americans serve are led by individuals morally, mentally, and physically qualified for the most severe and exhausting test of their capabilities.

Let me reiterate—I believe that unless we immediately provide a decent scale of pay and allowances that will attract good leadership of our military forces, we are foolish and stupid to spend on those forces the many billions of dollars we are now devoting to them. Without skilled leadership a military force is more helpless than if it were inadequately supplied with ration, transport, weapons, and ammunition.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. President, I believe that letter points out a fundamental truth; that is, that in our efforts to insure that enlisted personnel is fairly treated, we must not blind ourselves to the fact that leadership, too, is important, and must be fairly treated. That letter, which I have just quoted, expresses the considered judgment of one of the greatest soldiers that ever led an army of freemen to victory.



Now let us for a moment actually examine the record and see whether this bill favors the officer and neglects the enlisted man. I call attention to the table which appears on page 6 of our report, and I would ask Senators to examine the right-hand column of the table which shows the percentage increase in pay for the various officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men. If we examine the lower third of the table, we see that the percentage increases, reading down from the grade of master sergeant, are 24 percent, 28 percent, 37 percent, and so on down to 69 percent for the corporal having over 7 years' service, based upon the fact that these non-commissioned officers are married career enlisted personnel. Dropping to the bottom portion of the table, we note that the increase for a corporal is 26 percent, and then the figures for the lowest three grades drop to 9 percent, 6 percent, and so on down the column. This was based upon the Hook recommendations. The Hook Commission based their recommendations not only on their actuarial studies, but reached their conclusions by actually talking with many uncoached enlisted men of all three services. It should be noted also that the lowest three enlisted grades have during the relatively recent past received pay increases, of over 300 percent, based on the 1908 scales.

Now I would call attention to the percentage increases in pay granted to officers, as shown on the upper third of the table. I believe the Senate will agree that these increases are certainly more modest percentagewise than those granted to enlisted personnel. The committee does not feel that anyone who is familiar with the details of this proposed legislation can, with validity, contend that the Hook Commission, the House of Representatives, or your own committee, have discriminated against our enlisted personnel. Nothing was further from the thoughts, sentiments, or intentions of those groups.

One further thought is this: In addition to setting up a pay scale based upon skill and responsibility, this bill does the following additional things for the enlisted man:

First, it extends to him, for the first time, the same physical disability retirement laws as apply to officers.

Next, it places him on a par with officers in connection with travel and transportation allowances.

Next, it puts him in the same status as officers insofar as quarters allowances are concerned, as soon as he reaches the grade of corporal with 7 years' service, or as soon as he reaches the grade of sergeant, regardless of his length of service.

Next, it provides extra pay for foreign service, although such extra pay is taken away from officers.

In the light of these facts, we cannot agree that this bill is unfair to our enlisted personnel, or is partial to the officers.

Mr. President, it has been the earnest endeavor of your committee to make this bill fair and just to all. It is the sincere hope of the committee that the Senate will accept the views of the committee

and will pass the bill. The other groups which have labored diligently on this important and completely worthy proposal, as we regard it, have done well. The Hook Commission, the House Committee on Armed Services, and your own committee have striven to produce a fair piece of legislation to correct many inequities and injustices.

We hope this bill will be enacted as a measure of justice to the men and women of the armed services and as an important measure of national defense for the safety of our homeland and the preservation of peace in the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has listened attentively to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and as one who knows how hard he worked in preparing himself and in assembling all the facts, let me commend him for his thoughtful exposition of this very technical subject.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts more than I can express in language, for his undeserved compliment. I should like to add that in working a little on this bill, I was seeking only to emulate the example which was set by the eminent Senator from Massachusetts and others of my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

#### LIQUIDATION OF TRUSTS UNDER RURAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on or about May 25, Senate bill 930 passed the Senate and was recalled from the House, because of the fact that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] thought there should be an amendment to it. A motion to reconsider was entered and has been on the calendar ever since. I now ask that the votes by which the bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico spoke to me about this matter. I looked up the bill and discussed it with several of the

Members on this side of the aisle. I know of no objection to granting the request. Before it is granted, however, I should appreciate it if the Senator would tell us the amendments he proposes to offer to the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to do that. The amendments proposed are suggested by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. The language of the bill, which is a bill to provide for the liquidation of trusts under the old rural rehabilitation program, provides that when a rural rehabilitation corporation made certain applications it should then do certain things. The Senator from Colorado feels it would be much safer if the language provided that "the applicant" must do certain things; and his amendments merely strike out the word "corporation" and insert the word "applicant."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that the purpose of the amendment is to assist, and the purpose of the bill is not changed in any way. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. It is a safeguard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as I understand, it was the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] who made the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And the amendments are his amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes are reconsidered, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit the amendments offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 13, strike out "corporation" and insert "applicant."

On page 2, line 14, strike out "corporation" and insert "applicant."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "corporation" and insert "applicant."

On page 2, line 23, strike out "corporation" and insert "applicant."

On page 3, line 4, after "agreements" insert the following: "(conforming to the second sentence of this section)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from New Mexico for the Senator from Colorado.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, yesterday, during the consideration of the military aid bill, I submitted an amendment which complied with the House language and clarified the so-called maritime provision of 50-50 tonnage. By inadvertence, when the amendment was read, and the record so shows, the maritime section in the bill should have been

stricken out and the language of the amendment inserted. As it turns out, the language to strike out the section to which the committee agreed was not read. I have consulted with the Parliamentarian. The bill has not yet been printed nor enrolled, and he suggested that a unanimous-consent request will cure the situation. I have consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee, and I ask unanimous consent at this time, in order to correct the situation referred to, that the vote by which the bill was passed, the vote on the engrossment and third reading of the bill, the vote agreeing to the committee amendment as amended, and the vote agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, be reconsidered, and that the amendment of the Senator from Washington be deemed to be a substitute for section 409, that it be agreed to, and that the committee amendment as amended be agreed to, that the amendment be engrossed, and the bill be read a third time, and passed.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

**MR. SALTONSTALL.** Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would say that obviously what the Senator from Washington says is correct, and that the two sections together in the bill would be superfluous.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNITED STATES RESTRAINTS ON VISAS FOR CHINESE

**MR. KNOWLAND.** Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Chinese Won't Soon Forgive Us for Restraints on Visa Seekers," by Clyde Farnsworth, a Scripps-Howard staff writer. I wish to say that the general substance of the article is that, for perhaps the first time in our diplomatic history, a government which is a recognized government of a country has been told that its visas are not alone sufficient for entrance into this country by visitors, including official visitors, but that they must obtain the visa of a third country.

At the proper time, when we are discussing the nomination of Mr. Butterworth, on Monday, I think I shall be able to demonstrate by the presentation of facts that men in high position in the Government of China, and those who under normal diplomatic courtesy would be allowed to enter this country on a visitor's visa, were told they would have to go either to Hong Kong or to Korea to get either a British or a Korean visa in addition to the visa of their own country.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CHINESE WON'T SOON FORGIVE US FOR RESTRAINTS ON VISA SEEKERS (By Clyde Farnsworth)

HONG KONG, September 21.—It may be years before the anti-Communist Chinese can for-

give United States diplomatic officials for some of the things they have done recently.

Two incidents rankle most:

1. Premature closing of our Canton consulate, oldest United States diplomatic establishment in China; and
2. Recent State Department orders forbidding political visits to the United States of prominent Chinese.

#### CANTON DIDN'T FALL

The Canton consulate was closed August 24 by Minister Lewis Clark. According to Mr. Clark's calculations, Canton should have fallen to the Communists 4 weeks ago. It hasn't, but the Americans are gone. Mr. Clark notified the Chinese Foreign Office that United States interests were being transferred to the British consulate at Canton and the United States consulate here.

He said then he had information that the Communists would take Canton within a week. The Foreign Office asked for 24 hours to furnish details of Canton's defenses. Mr. Clark replied that the United States felt, on the basis of past experience, that it was not good for United States diplomatic officials to fall into Red hands.

Following the move, Mr. Clark flew from Hong Kong to Canton a few times in a Navy plane until Vice Adm. Oscar Badger stopped it. Since then First Secretary Robert C. Strong has made occasional commercial flights there.

Now only three American consulates are operating in Nationalist China—Taipei, Chungking, and Kunming. Diplomatic relations are limited to occasional contacts in Washington between Chinese Ambassador Wellington Koo and the State Department.

#### POLITICAL VISITS BANNED

The order forbidding political visits to the United States, in effect, has barred entrance by Nationalist spokesmen who conceivably might plead their cause to the American public.

The shut-down of the Canton consulate—established in 1896—amounts to a restraint on visa seekers since they now must go to Hong Kong.

An example is the case of Dr. Hollington Tong, former Information Minister, who asked for a visa to study operations in the United States of the Chinese Central News Agency. It is reported that Dr. Tong, a Missouri University graduate, was told to "find a better reason." He previously had traveled in America without difficulty.

Another case is that of Dr. Hu Shih, philosopher, educator, and former Chinese Ambassador to Washington, who now is teaching at Harvard. Dr. Shih was unaware of the difficulties in obtaining his passport, which he got only after United States Ambassador J. Leighton Stuart personally guaranteed he would not become a public charge.

When Dr. Shih learned of it, he said he would leave American soil and never return. Chinese officials, presumably more interested in "face" than in truth, assured him the reports were not true. Former ambassadors customarily are granted diplomatic visas by the countries where they have served.

#### SECOND VISAS REQUIRED

Chinese students seeking to study in the United States now are required to have visas to additional countries even though they are registered in American schools. The reason is that the United States some day may be unable to return them to a Red China, and thus wants to shunt them to the countries of their second visas. Many of these students spent 2 months hunting for visas from minor consulates, which often collected handsome fees for their service. Some obtained British visas by buying faked certificates of birth on British soil.

On the other side of the ledger, Ambassador Stuart's secretary, Philip Fugh, recently accompanied him to the United States after

their unsuccessful efforts in Nanking to establish diplomatic relations with the Chinese Reds. Mr. Fugh had neither passport nor visa, but apparently the State Department did not consider that trip political.

#### REFUSAL BY CERTAIN EXECUTIVE OFFICERS TO SUPPLY INFORMATION TO CONGRESS

**MR. KNOWLAND.** Mr. President, yesterday I telephoned the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Webb, and called his attention to the reports I have had in reference to the difficulties in regard to the issuance of visas to Chinese. I requested of him a copy of the circular which was sent to our consulates at both Canton and Hong Kong. From the conversation I had with Mr. Webb, I had reason to believe that I would get that information.

Today, my administrative assistant received a call from the Department of State. As a result, I have today addressed the following letter to Mr. Webb:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1949.

HON. JAMES E. WEBB,

*Under Secretary of State,  
Department of State,  
Washington, D. C.:*

DEAR MR. WEBB: On Thursday 22, I telephoned you, asking that you make available to me, instructions which had been sent to the American consuls in Hong Kong and Canton, which stated that visas issued to Chinese, with the exception of the permanent immigration type, would require a visa from a third country.

Today, Friday, September 23, Mr. Hummel, State Department Extension 2666, contacted Mr. Wilson of my office and stated that an official letter would be required before such information could be made available.

In view of the above information, please consider this a request for the instructions mentioned in the first paragraph.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. President, actually my administrative assistant reported that there was some indication from Mr. Hummel of the State Department, that that information could not be made available to me as a United States Senator because it was classified. Upon inquiry by my staff as to the reason for the classification, since obviously the instructions referred to did not relate to the national defense, the only reaction my staff could obtain was that the information might be embarrassing to the State Department.

Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate of the United States, and upon my responsibility as a United States Senator, I wish to say that if this body continues to let the executive branch of the Government of the United States hide behind an arbitrary iron curtain, then in my opinion we are abdicating our responsibility and authority as United States Senators. So long as I remain in this body, I have no intention of permitting any such thing to be done. The policy of this Government is not a policy of a few appointed executive department members or bureau heads or division chiefs. We are just as much a part of the Government of the United States as they are. We have our responsibilities to the people who send us to the Senate of the United States. Not only do we have responsibilities to the people of our own States, but we have responsibilities to every other citizen of the United States.



I say that in these critical times, when today we had a momentous announcement from the President of the United States, we dare not abdicate our responsibility in any degree. I intend to insist, insofar as it is within my ability so to do, that this body or any Member of this body shall be furnished such information as he feels is necessary in order for him properly to execute his oath of office.

#### ADVANCE PLANNING OF PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the pending bill, House bill 5007, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 762, Senate bill 2116, to provide for the advance planning of public works, which has been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Such a motion is not in order, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent it can be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 762, Senate bill 2116.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection to the passage of the bill as is, but I do have objections to amendments which may be offered and on which there will be a vote. There is not a quorum present, and I question whether the bill should be taken up at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. If there is any question about the amendments, can we have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill at 2 o'clock on Monday afternoon?

Mr. TAFT. No; I would object to that.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not now know how we are ever going to get the bill before the Senate. This is the third time I have tried to have it taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments on this particular bill have all been agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I did not know the Senator from Ohio was going to make this particular objection. I am sorry he has made it, but I hope that even his objection may be met, and I desire to outline the conditions at this time briefly for the information of the Senate, if I may.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to yield to me for a moment to make a very brief statement, by unanimous consent, relative to a statement I made on the floor of the Senate a few days ago?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in the RECORD of September 20, 1949, at page 13064, after referring to the fact that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was out of the city and expected to return the next morning, I stated:

I am informed by a representative of his office that the Senator from Ohio desires to suggest and to move, I assume, the incor-

poration in this bill of certain provisions relative to emergency school planning, and possibly, though I am not certain as to the latter, school construction.

Mr. President, that statement is in error, and I wish to have the RECORD corrected at this time. As I understand, it is not the intention of the Senator from Ohio to move the incorporation in the bill of the other language, at least I know of no such intention, and I was in error in making this statement. I was quite correct, I think, in pointing out that the Senator does oppose the insertion of the language which is proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] the effect of which would be to remove schools and school construction from the bill.

I observe, as I look over the RECORD, that obviously my own mind was becoming somewhat doubtful as to my initial statement as I proceeded, because I find that I started on page 13065:

It is my understanding, as indicated, though I say this with some degree of reservation as to the entire accuracy of the statement, that it is the probable purpose of the Senator from Ohio to offer an amendment which would probably have the effect, I think, of affirmatively setting forth in the bill some specific provisions in regard to the construction of schools.

Mr. President, I wanted to make this correction and to state that I was in error in stating that the Senator from Ohio desired to suggest and move the incorporation in the bill of other provisions. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri had previously told me of this situation. I had assured him that I felt that there would be no need at all for him to explain the situation to the Senate, but he insisted on so doing. I think his reputation for meticulous adherence to the truth as he knows it is so well established in the Senate that it was completely superfluous for him to have made this statement, yet I appreciate his having made it.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have conferred with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who was to offer the amendment on which the Senator from Ohio thought perhaps there would be some debate, or to which he thought there would be some objection, and that under those circumstances a quorum should be present. The Senator from Minnesota has agreed to withdraw the amendment, and offer it when he presents a bill which he reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I renew my request that H. R. 5007 be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2116.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2116) to provide for the advance planning of public works.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the committee have heretofore been agreed to, and the bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a few general observations with reference to Senate bill 2116 at this time, and then attempt to answer any questions, if there be any, which Members of the Senate would care to propound.

In the first place, I find myself in somewhat the same situation as that which confronted the senior Senator from Missouri a few minutes ago, in that on one or two occasions on the floor of the Senate I have referred to this bill as being a bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], which it certainly is, but also I have said that I had no part in the introduction of the bill, or words to that effect. I find that I was thinking of another measure, and that as a matter of fact, while the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico is the principal introducer of the bill, I recall now clearly that he invited his associates on the Committee on Public Works, or any of them who cared to do so, to join him in introducing and sponsoring the measure. I was one of those who was happy to accept the invitation. So I find, and I now place this in the RECORD so that no injustice shall be done to anyone, and so that my own previous statement may be corrected, that the bill was introduced by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for himself, and I read from the bill, "for Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. KERR, and Mr. CAIN," and it so comes on for debate at this time.

Mr. President, having made that statement, let me say that the bill is completely bipartisan, or nonpartisan, that it comes from the Public Works Committee with the unanimous vote of all members of the committee from both parties, and that if it have any feature at all which departs from the completely nonpartisan point of view, I am not familiar with the feature.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I desire to take this opportunity both to thank the Senator for his very kind remarks about me a few moments ago, and also to state substantially about him what he has said about me. I have known the Senator for years; we each served during a period of time in another official capacity, and I have the greatest respect and confidence in every statement he makes, and I know that whatever he says he thinks is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, Senate bill 2116, which comes on for consideration today, is in effect a continuance of a quite similar measure which was voted in 1944, and which was determined to be highly useful in the years from that time to June 30, 1947, when the last appropriation under that particular measure, as I understand, was either used, or the time elapsed during which it could be used.

The measure was adopted as a postwar measure, with the intent of allowing the advancement of Federal funds to States, counties, cities—any subdivision of States—to enable them to plan and prepare for non-Federal public works which were of importance to them.

The provision at that time was a little different from the present one, in that it provided that 90 percent of the entire amount appropriated should be distributed among the several States in proportion to population, whereas only 10 percent was held as a reserve for distribution where it might be most gravely needed, in the judgment of the Administrator. This time, because of the fact that the current recession has made itself felt so much more keenly in some parts of the Nation than in others, it was thought desirable by the Senator from New Mexico, and the others who joined him in introducing the measure—and I may say also that this is, as I understand, an administration measure—to have 25 percent of the total of the amount to be appropriated from time to time available for use in those communities where there might be a graver need of public works than in others, by reason of unemployment, or more acute suffering from the recession in those communities than in other communities of the Nation.

Mr. SCHOEPP. Who will determine that?

Mr. HOLLAND. The General Service Administrator, the Administrator of General Services.

Seventy-five percent of funds that may be appropriated under the pending bill is to be distributed among the States in proportion to their population. The other 25 percent as I have stated is available for special consideration in connection with particular needs, and of course the Congress makes the use of that 25 percent available for those special needs as they have been determined by the General Service Administrator.

Mr. President, the thought of the committee and of the introducers of the bill is that this Congress has already enacted into law one important public works measure which provides for planning and site acquisition in the field of post offices and of other needed Federal buildings, such as quarantine stations, public health hospitals, courthouses, and the like.

The Congress has already provided and has enacted into law a measure allowing for a very much needed public-works program in Alaska. The Congress has already, through its several committees, set up a backlog of public works, assuming that measures now in conference can be brought out of conference and can be passed, in the fields of civil functions of the Army engineers, for instance, in the field of public highways, and in other fields where badly needed public works exist all over our Nation.

However, up to this time, since the end of the fiscal year 1947, ending on June 30, 1947, there have been no Federal funds available for advancement to the States, and the local units of government, in order to provide a backlog of plans, engineering programs, and the like, for much needed non-Federal improvements. So this bill is designed to meet that need

by making available, during a period of 2 years from the date of the enactment of the measure, a sum not to exceed \$100,000,000, and, of course, that sum will be provided from time to time as the need is felt for distribution under the principles which I have already briefly discussed, to the various States and the public units within those States.

It is not contemplated that there will be any final granting or spending of Federal funds, Mr. President and Senators, except that it is recognized that in the very nature of things some of these programs for which advancements will be made, may not be realized, may not be carried out, and in the event that they are not carried out I think the Senate should understand that in those programs the Federal Treasury will have felt the effect of the expenditures, which will not be in such cases repaid. In all other cases wherever there is to be actual construction of these needed non-Federal public works, the requirement of the bill is that at the time of the letting of the contract the Federal advancement shall be repaid by the State or by the appropriate local unit within the State to which the advancement may have been made.

In this particular the bill is exactly like the one of 1944, which I mentioned a while ago, under which a total of some \$63,000,000 was advanced, and under which approximately 25 percent of that advancement has already been received back by the Federal Government, due to the fact that those particular projects for which those particular advancements were made have now been let and are either constructed or under process of construction.

I suppose each of us knows most of this program within his own State. Insofar as our State is concerned, this was an exceedingly worth-while program, and it resulted in making available sums of money for advance planning in such matters as the construction of sewage plants, of water plants, of filter plants, or public buildings of one kind or another, including school buildings, which were very badly needed, and which in many cases have now been either constructed or are under construction.

The junior Senator from Florida feels that this is an exceedingly meritorious program, as set up in the bill, and it is for that reason that he recommends it now, his recommendation coming, as already stated, from the unanimous membership of the Public Works Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the present circumstances and with the present state of affairs in the country with relation to the need for municipal improvements and State improvements, approximately how much of this appropriation for planning does the Senator expect will come back to the Federal Government? It would seem to me that a great deal of it would come back.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is my feeling and my expectation that a great deal of it will come back. The only figures I have which could be at all dependable or

would be other than a guess, are the figures furnished by the administrator of this older program, to which I have just referred. Approximately 25 percent of the advancements made under that older program have already been paid back into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The rate of expenditure in that program was about \$62,000,000 in 2 years, as I recall. But it ended in 1947, so there has been some accumulation.

My only doubt about the bill was the \$100,000,000 figure, but I assume that the Appropriations Committee would probably spread that over 2 or 3 years, and that is why it seemed to me unnecessary to make any objection. The bill provides really only an authorization. I do not understand that there is any proposal that the Appropriations Committee shall recommend an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the current year, and for that reason I withhold any objection to the \$100,000,000 figure. I hope it may last for 3 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, except that 2 years is the time prescribed under this particular measure.

I have the list here of the actual appropriations made under the other bill, and they were as follows: On May 3, 1945, \$17,500,000. December 28, 1945, that is that same year, \$12,500,000. On June 21, 1946, \$35,000,000. Or a total of \$65,000,000.

The final authority for committing expenditures expired June 30, 1947. So that the time in which this sum was available was about 2 years, as the Senator has stated, though as I understand it, the actual work did not get under way until after the war was over. At any rate some \$63,000,000-plus was actually used, and I am able to say to the Senator that the staff administering the program advise that there was \$33,000,000 more of applications for aid for planning what they regarded as meritorious projects, which were on hand but which they had not been able to service, at the time of the expiration of the authority on June 30, 1947.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any break-down by States of the way in which that money was used? Is that in the record somewhere?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe it is in the record, but I think we have it here, and I shall be very glad to place it in the RECORD. If the Senator will allow me to do so, let me say that if not available here it is available elsewhere, and that I shall be glad to place it in the RECORD.

The listed program which I have on hand relates solely to schools, because I had believed that under the amendment which was to have been offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that that probably would be the subject matter in which the Senator would be most interested, and I did ask to have prepared, and there was prepared, a list showing the applications with reference to schools which had been acted upon and on which



advancements had been made prior to the expiration date, and also a group of the applications in the same field of schools which were pending and could not be serviced at the time. If these would serve the purpose of the Senator—

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the Senator place them in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. At the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio I am very happy to ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this time, first a table entitled "Estimated Cost of Proposed Schools for Which Advances for Plan Preparation Have Been Approved by State as of August 31, 1949." That means it is brought to date, although the programs had to be approved prior to June 30, 1947.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Estimated cost of proposed schools for which advances for plan preparation have been approved, by States, as of Aug. 31, 1949*

State	Number of applications	Amount of plan advances	Total estimated cost
United States	1,963	\$14,709,764	\$642,162,415
Alabama	10	75,039	3,443,686
Arizona	17	105,513	5,218,269
Arkansas	16	130,375	4,633,803
California	210	1,106,528	47,796,974
Colorado	19	128,493	5,580,647
Connecticut	11	140,550	6,185,002
Delaware	12	89,476	5,603,530
Florida	86	450,451	18,094,423
Georgia	8	51,925	2,891,785
Illinois	61	566,672	27,373,526
Indiana	27	262,310	10,394,214
Iowa	16	196,964	6,011,803
Kansas	45	403,289	13,894,445
Kentucky	45	393,609	16,985,244
Louisiana	17	63,819	1,990,780
Maine	15	90,806	4,503,543
Maryland	39	369,480	20,133,583
Massachusetts	66	588,004	25,587,780
Michigan	64	735,238	47,363,013
Minnesota	22	194,459	7,558,470
Mississippi	26	127,821	5,344,490
Missouri	56	459,268	24,648,970
Montana	13	102,153	4,045,126
Nebraska	18	69,929	2,752,650
Nevada	13	107,154	3,218,603
New Hampshire	29	177,767	6,202,337
New Jersey	123	1,169,152	47,353,620
New Mexico	12	43,023	3,595,081
New York	56	1,244,948	35,974,774
North Carolina	111	372,122	14,633,297
North Dakota	7	46,422	1,788,125
Ohio	126	764,214	32,838,104
Oklahoma	31	241,881	9,116,881
Oregon	30	89,507	4,584,470
Pennsylvania	87	772,924	44,082,005
Rhode Island	6	87,012	3,824,900
South Carolina	59	201,179	9,030,453
South Dakota	2	3,580	281,290
Tennessee	30	208,602	8,147,338
Texas	132	728,554	33,242,864
Utah	9	41,404	1,671,582
Vermont	26	204,844	9,594,878
Virginia	20	342,008	13,417,228
Washington	25	160,127	8,182,585
West Virginia	53	197,781	6,810,892
Wisconsin	34	291,023	13,248,528
Wyoming	12	87,825	5,089,320
Alaska	7	103,150	5,368,250
Hawaii	4	71,000	2,919,254

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a second table entitled "Estimated Cost of Proposed Schools for Which Advances for Plan Preparation Have Been Deferred Due to Expiration of Authority or Funds, by State as of August 31, 1949." These lists have been prepared at my request.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Estimated cost of proposed schools for which advances for plan preparation have been deferred due to expiration of authority or funds, by States, as of Aug. 31, 1949*

State	Number of applications	Amount of plan advances	Total estimated cost
United States	880	\$10,118,705	\$290,170,649
Alabama	3	49,005	833,409
Arizona	7	92,680	2,524,135
Arkansas	5	31,636	974,730
California	48	463,663	9,583,680
Colorado	11	372,970	8,705,246
Connecticut	10	164,500	5,107,260
Delaware	64	336,404	9,150,921
Florida	51	661,940	18,191,856
Georgia	49	1,031,820	30,583,527
Idaho	4	12,600	353,950
Illinois	13	77,948	1,900,108
Indiana	19	116,419	3,225,141
Iowa	8	97,922	1,509,770
Kansas	15	104,025	4,190,340
Kentucky	6	200,038	5,267,575
Louisiana	25	307,534	8,404,992
Maine	43	290,304	11,515,000
Maryland	17	177,881	4,576,519
Massachusetts	6	150,972	4,172,320
Michigan	24	349,436	18,097,065
Minnesota	6	21,209	707,680
Mississippi	1	10,000	316,196
Missouri	19	163,909	4,701,680
Montana	80	1,746,272	44,635,904
Nebraska	1	93,750	2,640,000
Nevada	31	641,176	16,044,633
New Hampshire	13	42,807	1,365,117
New Jersey	3	7,610	293,223
New Mexico	30	184,296	5,269,359
New York	4	30,600	2,033,000
North Carolina	23	145,486	4,958,763
North Dakota	1	55,000	1,529,500
Ohio	88	497,079	17,522,201
Oklahoma	1	1,440	39,000
Oregon	65	566,410	15,036,324
Pennsylvania	38	264,535	8,533,315
Rhode Island	4	42,624	1,250,920
South Carolina	4	22,900	577,200
South Dakota	2	42,225	1,873,100
Tennessee	11	176,761	3,845,079
Texas	17	97,083	2,780,868
Utah	1	3,500	80,447
Vermont	5	162,600	4,238,896
Virginia	4	10,055	457,700
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
Hawaii			
Puerto Rico			

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My understanding is that the bill expressly states that there is no implied obligation on the part of the Federal Government to contribute to any of the public works for which plans are made.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. There is specific provision in the bill to the effect that the Federal Government shall not be considered to have in any way held forth the offer to contribute to the cost of construction.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude briefly. There are two classes of activities with respect to which this program has particular value. One is the case of local public works which are required to be financed, under the State or local law, or both, by the voting of bond issues by the people. It has been found of very great help in enabling the public to have a clear understanding of what is intended, and to assure itself that the program as intended will actually cover the needs of the community in that particular field of needed public works, by hav-

ing the plans developed and the cost of fulfillment of the plans estimated reliably before the program is submitted to the vote of the people. I am sure that Senators are all familiar with situations of the type which I have mentioned, in which the public has been reluctant to approve a program until it has specific information that the program will meet its needs and may be financed within a specific amount which the public is willing to vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator a question with reference to section 4. I believe the same section was in the previous law. I gather from the wording of that section that the minute any construction is started the full sum of the advance must be repaid.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to point out that that has become a very serious handicap and liability in certain communities. For example, I know of a particular instance in which a substantial advance was made to a municipality for the construction of a large hospital. At the time the advance was made it was presumed that the hospital could be constructed for the amount of the bond issue; but as we all know, the cost of hospital construction skyrocketed, and by the time they got ready to build the hospital they could build only about one-third of it. They had to repay the entire amount of planning funds for only a partial job. That seemed to be somewhat of an undue burden and a bit unfair.

I recall another instance, in which plans for a municipal building had been provided under the terms of the former law. When the municipal authorities got around to making changes, they used only a part of the plans, that is, the part pertaining to the new elevator shafts. Yet they had to pay back approximately \$90,000 advanced for plans, to construct a \$20,000 project. They had not had opportunity to go ahead with the full program.

It was a very serious burden on the community. A \$20,000 project required \$90,000 worth of plans. The terms of the law were a little exacting. It seems to me that the money ought to be paid back when the project is completed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his contribution. Undoubtedly the form of the program was not perfect, and undoubtedly this one will not be perfect. I am sure that specific projects may be found in various parts of the Nation with respect to which the program has not worked to the full satisfaction of all concerned. Yet it is a fact, I think—certainly in my State—that the program has been of very great value to numerous communities. It is regarded as one of the most helpful things which has been done as we approached the postwar period. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that if there is undue hardship in a specific case, if the onus on a particular community is inequitable and too heavy, it

can, of course, ask for relief, and I am sure that its request would be promptly and sympathetically handled by the appropriate committees of Congress, and that the community could be granted relief from the actual letter of the law or of its agreement.

I am sure that there have been unsatisfactory situations as the Senator has pointed out. However, viewing the program by and large, it seems to the junior Senator from Florida, and I think it appeared to the membership of the Public Works Committee unanimously, that no program that could be thought out by us was more nearly designed to advance to a high state of completion the planning, the doing of the architectural and engineering work, so that a real backlog of needed public improvements may be ready when we reach the time when we need them.

We should all remember that, after all, the local units, or the State itself, if it is the State which is involved, must take the initiative. No program is undertaken except one which is asked for at that level. If there is a State agency involved in the general field, as in the field of school construction, any particular project cannot be accepted here in Washington unless the local project complies with and is a part of the general State program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not want my remarks to be interpreted as a criticism of the provisions of the bill, because I am very much for it. I merely wished to point out, for the purpose of the legislative history, that there are instances in which plans are made for large civic-center developments which are all under one project. For example, a project with respect to which an advance of money is made to a municipality may consist of five or six buildings. When the community gets around to constructing one building, it is obligated to pay back all the money advanced for all the plans.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator may be correct; but my information is otherwise. I have been advised by the staff of the Public Works Committee and by representatives of the Public Works Administration that in such a case they prefer to have the projects broken down into separate projects. That would relieve the community from a situation such as the Senator has described.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me further develop this point with the Senator. For example, instances could be found in which a three- or four-story civic center was planned, to include a public library and a basement, using the portion from the second story down as a parking unit. Obviously the construction of the project starts at the bottom. The community receives perhaps \$175,000 for planning. It then goes ahead and begins the project. It starts with the basement unit. Then something happens, and that is as far as it gets. That means that the community must pay back the entire amount of the planning funds, even though the initial investment may not be as much as the planning funds. Many municipal-

ities ran into exactly that sort of situation. I had hoped that this colloquy might result in liberalizing the application of section 4 in instances of hardship. It has not always been easily liberalized.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment of the distinguished Senator. It seems to me that anyone reading the legislative history—at least in the Senate—would come to the conclusion that it is advisable for the local unit of government to break down the projects so far as it is reasonably possible to do it. There is no reason why they cannot be broken down so long as they are susceptible of being divided into separate units.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Florida if the history of the development of this type of program has indicated that it is more satisfactory to break the project down into sections than to consider it as a single unit.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry that I cannot answer that question categorically. However, I can answer with assurance that there have been instances in which the projects have been broken down, and that when they are reasonably susceptible of being broken down into separate construction units, that is certainly a permissible way to approach the problem. I am sorry that I cannot give the Senator the information which his question calls for.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator from Florida, who is a former State official, agree with me that when projects are essentially municipal or State projects in character the State takes a certain pride, and also a degree of responsibility, in paying for its own public works? It is very much better for the Federal Government to have all the money paid back in advance, so that there will be no question about the Federal Government interfering with the building of the works after the plans have been made. If the Senator from Minnesota knows of certain cases in which this system has worked a hardship, such a situation would call for special legislation, as the Senator from Florida pointed out. Does not the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's observations, and I agree entirely with his statement. I think it is highly desirable in the ordinary case for the State or local unit of government to have fully discharged its obligation to the Federal Government, so that it may be entirely free from any control as it proceeds under its own initiative to complete the construction. I thank the Senator for that observation.

Mr. President, I have already mentioned briefly the condition existing—and it exists in many places and in connection with many kinds of needed public construction—where a bond issue has to be voted ahead of time; and I have pointed out the fact that the making of these advancements enables the people

to know with much greater certainty and assurance that the program is desirable from their standpoint, and therefore embraces the possibility of adoption of the program.

There is a second class of cases in which this program is almost equally desirable, and that is in connection with a very large group of public-works projects which customarily, these days, are financed on a self-liquidating basis. The question of whether bidders can be obtained for the securities lying behind that construction often depends upon whether it is possible to demonstrate by means of plans, specifications, and estimates that the work can be done and the project can be completed and put in useful condition by means of the expenditure of funds within the amount of money sought to be borrowed. I believe that too much attention cannot be given to that particular point of view, namely, that in many cases it is necessary to have plans, specifications, and, in addition, estimates available if we wish to obtain bids from financial firms which buy securities of that kind, which are self-liquidating. Of course we not only want the communities to get bidders, but we want the bidders to sharpen their pencils so that the public may obtain the lowest possible rates of interest available under existing market conditions. Certainly that purpose is served by having plans, specifications, and estimates available.

Mr. President, I shall not further detain the Senate in regard to this matter. I believe the program is a meritorious one. I believe that all Senators now present join in that view. I hope the Senate will see fit to approve the program and will vote in favor of passage of this bill, Senate bill 2116.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the committee report on the bill, which is short and to the point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 751) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2116) to provide for the advance planning of public works, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments consist of striking out the references throughout the bill to the Federal Works Administrator and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator of General Services," since the functions of the former Federal Works Agency have been transferred by law to the General Services Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to maintain an adequate reserve of fully planned public works readily available in order that construction may be started promptly, when economic conditions should make such action desirable. This will be accomplished by authorizing the making of advances during a period of 2 years following the date of approval of this act to States and political subdivisions thereof for the purpose of financing the cost of surveys, engineering investigations, and plans preliminary to the construction of local public works such as, but not limited to, schools, other public



buildings, sewerage works, water-supply systems, and other local public works.

The bill authorizes to be appropriated not to exceed a total of \$100,000,000 for the 2-year period. The funds will be allocated among the several States by the Administrator of General Services in the following manner: 75 percent in the proportion of State population to the total United States population, and 25 percent in accordance with the needs of the States as determined by the Administrator. The Administrator would also be permitted to reallocate any remainder of the initial State allocations which cannot promptly be utilized. The committee feels that before any such reallocations are made, the Administrator should allow the States a period of at least 1 year in which to make use of their respective allocations. It is the understanding of the committee that this policy will be followed by the Administrator.

All advances to the public agencies will be repaid in full without interest by those agencies if and when construction of the works planned with those advances is undertaken or started. No advances will be made for any individual project unless it conforms to an over-all State, local, or regional plan approved by competent State or local authorities.

The bill specifically provides that the making of these advances shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake the construction of any public works so planned.

This program is in effect a continuation of a similar program authorized in title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944. That program was developed in anticipation of the need for postwar expansion of public works activities. The program was very successful, and a considerable backlog of planned projects was built up, but in the intervening years it has been substantially reduced through construction of the planned projects. Approximately 25 percent of the Federal funds advanced under that program have already been returned to the Treasury.

The postponement of public works activities during the long war period has accumulated a large need for construction of local public buildings and other community facilities. Estimates of this need range up to \$100,000,000,000. This huge accumulation of needs could be used at any time in the future as a cushion against declining economic activity, provided proper preparations are made to place this work under construction when needed. Local agencies, however, frequently, have difficulty in financing the preparation of plans in advance of their preparation for construction, since most local public works financing is handled by means of bond issues covering the entire cost of the project. The proceeds from such bond issues are therefore not available in advance at the time when planning should be undertaken. This bill would permit local agencies to obtain the necessary planning funds and to proceed with all planning phases without the necessity for awaiting financing arrangements for the construction work.

Legislation similar to that contained in this bill was recommended in the President's recent midyear economic report. This bill has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration. The reports of these two agencies on S. 2116 follow:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington 25, D. C., July 18, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Public Works, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This will acknowledge your letter of June 24, 1949, requesting the views of the Bureau upon S.

2116, to provide for the advance planning of public works.

The Bureau can report to you that the enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,  
Assistant Director.

JUNE 30, 1949.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is in response to your letter dated June 24, 1949, requesting my views respecting S. 2116 entitled "A bill to provide for the advance planning of public works."

My considered opinion is that your committee should report favorably on the bill, and I so recommend. Such legislation would be in the public interest and would (1) provide a sound, practicable, and economical procedure for encouraging and stimulating the planning of public works by local public agencies; (2) make available an adequate shelf of fully planned non-Federal public works (exclusive of housing) ready for immediate use in time of economic stress; (3) permit Federal public works, through knowledge of the planned non-Federal public works, to be properly timed to serve the best interests of the Nation; and (4) produce immeasurable benefits to the economy, health, and general welfare of the country as a whole.

As indicated by its title, the bill contemplates Federal aid to States and local public bodies for advance planning of public works. The program authorized under the bill would be similar to that administered by this agency pursuant to title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, which latter program received general approval by State, municipal, and other local officials, engineers, architects, contractors, economists, labor unions, and the public. It is anticipated that if S. 2116 be enacted into law it will be received in like manner.

The bill would authorize the making of advances for plan preparation during the 2-year period immediately following the date upon which the legislation is to become effective, and the appropriation of not in excess of \$100,000,000 for that purpose. Upon the basis of this agency's experience under the previous advance planning program, we estimate that with the \$100,000,000 appropriation there would be planned public works costing in the neighborhood of \$3,000,000,000.

The advance planning program envisioned under the bill offers many obvious advantages, including particularly the following:

1. It will permit the development and the maintenance of a reserve shelf of fully planned non-Federal public works ready to be constructed as economic conditions warrant. The experience of the Federal Works Agency indicates that generally many months elapse between the time a city determines to construct a public works project and the date on which construction of the project actually is commenced. Frequently the planning of a public works project consumes more time than its actual construction. With a shelf of fully planned public works, delays in putting men to work on projects can be materially reduced and the stemming of hazardous drops in construction activity can thus be made more effective.

2. The proposed advance planning program has the further advantage of enabling local public bodies to finance the construction of public works at lower costs. Many water-works systems, sewers, and other public facilities are being financed today through the issuance of revenue bonds. In view of the uncertainty respecting construction costs, private investors are unwilling to commit themselves to the purchase of revenue bonds, in many instances, until the plans have been prepared and a reasonably accurate

determination of the cost of the proposed public works has been made. The preparation of the plans and specifications for public works under the proposed program will enable municipalities to obtain reasonably accurate cost estimates and thus will permit them to procure the necessary financing upon more reasonable rates. In addition, the advance preparation of plans and specifications under conditions enabling a municipality to give careful consideration to the many factors involved should eliminate expensive changes during the progress of the work and thus reduce the over-all cost of the project.

3. The advance preparation of plans and specifications for public-works projects which, as the bill provides, are to be integrated in over-all State, local, or regional plans, will result in the construction of public-works projects upon a stable basis and in better-planned communities. This limitation of advances to projects conforming to over-all State, local, or regional plans approved by competent State, local, or regional non-Federal authorities should thus make for far better integration of public facilities than was the case in the past when many public works were built in haphazard fashion without any sound or functional coordination among them.

4. Under the bill, the Federal Government would provide the leadership and encouragement needed to assure the creation of an adequate reserve of State and local public works at a rather nominal cost to the Federal Government. The proposed legislation provides that the advances are to be repaid to the Federal Government when the planned construction is undertaken. Although it is possible that some of the public works planned under the program may not actually be undertaken and some few advances will thereby not be repaid, our experience in the administration of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 indicates that most of the money paid out by the Federal Government will be recovered and that the actual cost to the Federal Government will be relatively small. Every citizen recognizes the value of planning for the future and the importance of insurance in his private affairs. S. 2116 proposes the continuation of a form of planning of attested value in the field of government which, at the same time, affords an inexpensive form of economic insurance.

Section I of the bill contains the salutary proviso that "the making of advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake the construction of any public works so planned." A similar provision was also included in the prior law, and was emphasized to the local public bodies to which planning advances were made by incorporation in the advance planning regulations of this Agency.

As of the close of business June 30, 1947, when title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 expired, planning advances in the amount of \$61,663,079 had been approved by the Federal Works Administrator for the preparation of final plans and specifications for 7,338 local public works projects estimated to cost approximately \$2,400,000,000. The types of public works most heavily represented thereby, both in number of projects and in estimated construction costs, were sewer, water, and sanitation facilities, school and other educational facilities. This was to be expected because with the increase in the volume of residential construction the need for sewers, water facilities, and schools becomes acute. Other types for which advances were made include streets, bridges, viaducts and grade separations, airport facilities, hospital and other health facilities, park and other recreational facilities, municipal halls and other public buildings, and miscellaneous public works. It is obvious, therefore, that the Federal funds disbursed were made available to prepare final plans and specifications

for public works having the greatest utilitarian value. It is anticipated that, if S. 2116 be enacted into law, the public works planned thereunder will be of equal utilitarian value.

When the authority to make new advances under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 expired on June 30, 1947, we had on hand awaiting approval approximately 2,300 applications for advance planning aid. The total funds requested by these applications were approximately \$33,000,000. None of these applications could, of course, be approved.

Despite the progress that has been made thus far in building up a shelf of fully planned useful public-works projects at a comparatively nominal cost to the Federal Government, the objectives of title V have not been fully achieved. Plans have been fully completed on 5,580 of the 7,338 approved applications, and 1,477, or over one-fourth of the former total, have been placed under construction. Of the \$61,669,079 obligated for advances to complete the plans for the 7,338 projects mentioned above, \$14,662,047 has been returned to the Government either in the form of repayments when the projects were placed under construction or recoveries due to cancellations of projects. It is evident, therefore, that the reserve of projects, which was not large enough to meet the public works construction needs of the Nation for even one normal construction year, is fast diminishing and will in time be completely depleted unless steps are taken to see that it is replenished.

This need for the stimulation of advance planning and for maintaining a high level of fully planned public-works projects still exists. The goal should be a continuing and adequate reserve of fully planned public works readily available for use so as to permit the immediate commencement of construction when the economic situation may make such action desirable. It is definitely in the national interest to expand the reserve in order to provide an adequate backlog in times of business recession.

We have been advised informally by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of S. 2116 would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON, Administrator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to Senate bill 2116. When the majority leader requested unanimous consent that the bill be brought up for consideration, he was confronted with the observation that consent would be withheld if any amendments were offered.

It had been my intention to propose to the bill an amendment which I think is fundamental and very important, and which I believe many persons throughout the country, particularly those interested in education, believe should have been given consideration. However, in view of the importance of the public works planning bill and the funds provided under it, I felt that it would be imprudent on my part or very inconsiderate, to insist upon my amendment and thereby possibly jeopardize the favorable consideration of this important piece of legislation.

It was for that reason that I acceded to the wishes, and the implorations of some of my colleagues, and was willing to withdraw or withhold the proposed amendment.

I should like to read the proposed amendment, so that Senators may know what was intended. I intended to pro-

pose, on page 2, following line 20, the following:

*Provided, however, That the authority herein granted shall not apply to the planning of public schools, elementary and secondary, in the event that subsequent legislation authorizing funds for public-school planning and surveys and other purposes is enacted.*

In other words, if at a later date legislation pertaining to public-school plans, surveys, and inventories should be enacted, such legislation would have priority over the legislation which has been passed, or which I trust will be passed, namely, Senate bill 2116.

I point out that school superintendents throughout the country, and particularly State superintendents of schools, are very deeply concerned about the nature of planning activities pertaining to public, elementary, and secondary schools. It is my intention, Mr. President, to use all the power at my command and all the influence I can possibly gather to bring up in the Senate a bill which is now on the calendar, Senate bill 2317. I should like to state why I think that bill should be considered and passed, and why I feel that the pending bill does not meet the need. It is because the planning of public educational facilities is an educator's job, not an architect's job. The architect should be in a sense an adviser and consultant to the primary purpose of education. It has been found that in hospital construction serious mistakes were made in the planning of hospitals and clinics because the doctors were not consulted, because the people who were going to use the facilities were not given the position of priority in ultimate planning they ought to have.

What is more important, just so surely as we are on the floor of the Senate today, between now and the next 5 or 6 years requests in great number are going to be made upon the Government of the United States for assistance in public-school building construction. I predict at this hour that unless we develop a type of integrated State-plan program, under which the State department of education correlates its plans, under which it allots and distributes the money, and under which the State department of education will make the final decisions as to a State-wide school-construction program, we will have representatives of every school district in America here beseeching the Congress of the United States for advance planning money and for construction money.

It was the purpose of the amendment which the junior Senator from Minnesota intended to offer to make possible this type of integrated, coordinated State plan, survey, and inventory of school needs. In other words, the bill which I trust will be considered in the not-too-distant future is more comprehensive, as it pertains to schools, than the bill presently before the Senate. I commend the Public Works Committee for the splendid job they have done in this \$100,000,000 advance planning fund bill, but I say again that when the majority leader permits us to bring up the other legislation on school construction and school plans, we shall seek your support.

I want merely to cite this fact, that right here in the city of Washington, the Nation's Capital, where the Congress of the United States cannot evade its responsibilities, there is a national disgrace in public education. Swing shifts in Washington, Mr. President. The children of this city cannot even find space in which to attend school, in the great city of Washington. All over America, the same thing is existent.

As I said in our Labor Committee the other day, it ill becomes a government that says it is a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," to shirk its responsibilities for education. I remember the day I sat in the Senate Chamber, in this room, and in 2½ minutes—in less than 2½ minutes—the Senate voted an authorization for \$300,000,000 for wind tunnels—wind tunnels that no one will ever see, except a few engineers. Wind tunnels for testing aircraft—however, when one starts talking about a few school buildings, when one starts talking about the Federal Government assistance in providing these needed facilities, there is opposition—opposition because it appears to be a new departure. Yet this same Government can and does conscript these boys and girls who now need schools. As we have on the floor of the Senate those who say it is not a responsibility of the Federal Government, I press this point, because, as a father, as a citizen, and as an American, I think that one of our first responsibilities is in the matter of education. I do not think the arguments sound very well, Mr. President, when I hear people say we ought not to go into this activity. We go into every other activity. We build roads and hospitals. We are helping build universities now. We are going to have money provided in a bill that will be considered possibly today for grants to universities, to enable them to build research laboratories. Yes, we can give Federal Government assistance so that we can house white mice, or some other kind of animal, to test out a vaccine or a virus. But when it comes to building a public school, or when it comes to providing the funds that may be necessary even for school surveys and inventories, then it seems to go against the principle of separation of local and Federal and State government. Well, it does not go against the principles of the junior Senator from Minnesota, and I repeat, I feel that one of the most important items of legislation that we have on the calendar is Federal aid to provide the funds which are necessary for the construction of schools. We have another Federal education program which is tied up in a very bitter argument, on which there are two sides. But I point out there is no religious question, there is no sectarian question involved as to whether we ought to build public educational facilities; none whatever.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I was interested in the remark made by the junior Senator from Minnesota about the condition of schools in Washington, D. C. I feel sure the Senator is aware of the fact



that not too many weeks ago a request was made for \$3,000,000 for some kind of celebration in Washington, D. C., which might well have been dispensed with and put into the school system, in order to avoid the very thing the Senator is mentioning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be more than glad to concur in giving the \$3,000,000 to the schools. I recognize requests have been made all around through the Congress. We are going to vote a budget that I imagine is going to run from forty to fifty billions of dollars, and yet all over the Nation we have the problem of a lack of educational facilities. It is not merely a lack of teachers. It is not only a matter of teachers or teachers' salaries or administrative expenses. We have Quonset schooling in some sections of this country. We put up a tin can with a roof on it, and we call it a school. I repeat, it is right here in this city, where the President of the United States deplored the condition of schools in Washington, D. C. What he should have said—if it is possible for one to correct his President in an official statement—not only that he deplored the condition of overcrowding in the schools of Washington, but that he deplored overcrowding in schools all over America.

I made a commitment to the school officers of the country that I would offer an amendment to give them protection for the kind of plans and educational facilities that they themselves feel are so vital and so important. Unfortunately, that amendment, if offered, would have denied us the chance to vote on this bill, S. 2116. I regret that Senator TAFT objected to my amendment. I withdrew it only to facilitate passage of an important item of legislation.

I repeat, the only reason I withdrew my amendment is because I feel that there are other needs that must be met. I want to commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the distinguished junior Senator from Florida for the presentation of this bill. Let it never be forgotten for a single minute, as long as I am a Member of the United States Senate—I shall be working for Federal aid for school children and school construction, because I think it is vital. I want the American people to know we did not take 2 minutes to spend \$300,000,000 to be used in 5 years for wind tunnels. I think we ought to be able to appropriate a few million dollars to provide schools, in order to assure an opportunity for healthy, intelligent, enlightened young Americans.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I note the remarks of the junior Senator from Minnesota with reference to wind tunnels. Is the Senator aware that that measure was held up for at least three calendar calls?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not recall that specifically, but if I happen to be so enlightened, I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Kansas bringing it to my attention.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the issues here are somewhat obscured. The bill which the distinguished Sena-

tor from Minnesota is sponsoring, and which will probably come up later, is not a bill for the construction of schools. It is a bill for the planning of schools. We have not decided to put the Federal Government into the business of constructing schools. I do not say that we may not reach that point; but I feel very strongly it is more important that those of us who are interested in education should first have settled the question whether we are going to help the administration of schools.

I think it is most important that the general distribution of school facilities be first considered, particularly in districts where children are left at this time without any education. While the school-building program throughout the country is behind the point at which it should be, because it was delayed by the war, there is no substantial evidence that the States cannot handle it themselves. I repeat, I am not saying we may not come to the time when we shall consider the question of Federal aid to school construction, but there is always the danger in any public-works program that it will be much more expensive. Any public-works program is very likely to result in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. I am afraid that every Senator and Representative likes to have a monument in his home town to point to as something which he secured for the municipality or State. If any funds are provided, they must go equitably to every school district in the country. The Federal Government, in public-works programs, spends very large sums. I hope we can settle that policy before we proceed further.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in reporting the bill to which the distinguished Senator has referred, left out the construction end. I do not think we should provide a planning program which impliedly commits us, in effect, to say that we are going on next year to help finance the program, as provided in the original bill and as clearly stated in the committee report. I object to committing the Federal Government, indirectly, to that extent, by simply providing planning money on that basis.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not agree with the reasons given by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. So far as the schools in Cincinnati are concerned, we do not want the Federal Government to have anything to do with planning them. We have a perfectly competent plan. The schools have been designed and planned on a local basis. The idea that there must be a State-aid plan in order to bring about a comprehensive school-construction program simply is not the fact. Each district knows how many children it has to provide for and the general type of school it should have. I think there should be some restrictions to assure that undue expense is not incurred. In general it is not like the State-planned building of hospitals, where no plan was ever previously had, and a private hospital was here, a private hospital there, and a general hospital somewhere else. In my State the school districts resent State

interference, and each of them has its own views.

I do not see why we should not postpone the matter until we can decide the question whether we want to help finance school-building construction. Schools can get money for planning, under the Chavez bill, if they need it badly. But I believe the general idea of a new survey of every State to see what kind of schools it should have is not a good one. I think that is primarily the concern of the States and is something which the States are doing very satisfactorily. Incidentally, the States are spending approximately \$3,000,000,000 on school construction, which is about one-third of their total expenditures. It is their primary obligation.

Even in the field of assistance to the teachers in the poorer districts of the country I certainly approach it with great trepidation, because it seems to me we are infringing on a function which is primarily a State and local concern. In my opinion we should help them only in cases in which it is clearly proved that they cannot do it themselves. I think that is proved in the case of the operation of schools in many of the poorer States.

Mr. President, what we passed was an equalization bill. I am willing to consider the other bill, but I think it should be postponed until we are willing to consider the substantive question of whether we want to put the Federal Government into a general program of aiding school construction. On that subject I should like to have more information before we act upon it. In the meantime, I do not think we should prescribe a system of planning with the clear implication that we will finance it. That would interfere with the program, because every State will wait until it finds out what we are going to do next year or the year after next. I think we should not commit ourselves at this time to any kind of State aid. I think, impliedly, the bill of the Senator from Minnesota does that. That is why I am against it, not because in time to come I think we should not consider the question of aiding in school building, but I should like to have the other question settled first.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may be incorrect, but I think that in the bill which the Senators are discussing there are some emergency provisions.

Mr. TAFT. I am in favor of the emergency provisions, but I do not believe they should be tied in with this sum for planning all over the country. When that bill comes up—I certainly shall not object to taking it up—I would hope to eliminate the sum provided for planning, and put it through on an emergency basis.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the Senator's position.

#### CURTAILMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like, while I have the floor, to make a brief statement on another subject. In the newspapers it has been stated that

representatives of the State Department and other Government representatives had agreed to curtail the requirements for synthetic rubber in this country in order to help the British to get more dollars.

I protest against that policy. I think our Government is making a tremendous mistake. The Rubber Advisory Committee is meeting today. I should like to read a telegram from Mr. Freeland, president of the Dayton Rubber Co. and Copolymer Corp., which sets forth the situation as he sees it. He says:

DAYTON, OHIO, September 20, 1949.

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT,  
United States Senator, United States  
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

At meeting Rubber Advisory Committee called by Commerce Department Friday, September 23, which I will attend, will discuss for immediate action a revision of present R-1 order that specifies mandatory use of something over 200,000 tons synthetic rubber per year. State Department in order encourage use natural rubber bringing very strong pressure to either throw out entire R-1 order or modify it to such extent that we feel will be detrimental to best interests of national security and American taxpayer. At present cold rubber which is exceeding all expectations as to its merit is being produced at rate of 180,000 to 200,000 tons per year. Any decrease in mandatory use below this figure will be harmful and may cause an increase in price of synthetic rubber further would have discouraging effect on American scientific progress.

A. L. FREELANDER,  
President, the Dayton Rubber Co.  
and Copolymer Corp.

That progress is being made in synthetic rubber. The more it is used, the more it is improved and developed. Last week I went through a rubber plant in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, which manufactures rubber gaskets and rubber strips that go around refrigerators and automobile windows. I was told that they much preferred synthetic rubber for that purpose, that it was easier to work, and that in their business they are now using 70 percent synthetic rubber and 30 percent natural rubber. Of course, their products are probably more susceptible to the use of synthetic rubber. Nevertheless, it is a tremendous development, and one which is going to be very essential for national security in time of war. The program referred to would result in closing down plants, which would be a dead loss to the Government of the United States. The requirements at this time are not unreasonable and are in no way interfering with the manufacture of rubber products.

Furthermore, such an agreement will not help the British workmen or British industry improve their position or sell more products. It is a method to make it necessary to buy more rubber from Malaya, where the workers who produce it are paid approximately 10 cents an hour, or less. The British are getting the advantage of that labor in the production of dollars which they take away from the workers in Malaya and use for the purpose of buying food for the British people.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have any information on the subject, but I was curious to know whether the able Senator from Ohio knows whether any of the domestic synthetic rubber plants were built by the Government during the war.

Mr. TAFT. I think they were all built by the Government and leased to various operating companies. Of course, a series of plants is required. There are the preliminary plants which make butadiene and styrene. Then there are the plants which put the two together into rubber. It was determined before this conference with the British that it was necessary, in order to keep the industry alive, to manufacture a certain amount of synthetic rubber, and in order to provide the scientific progress necessary to improve such rubber. If it was determined to be necessary then, it is just as necessary today, or more necessary today. So, simply in order to assist Great Britain to get dollars from their Malayan dependencies, I see no reason whatever why we should change our policy affecting national security and the future development and improvement of synthetic rubber, and the gradual development of an industry in this country which will improve the general welfare of the people.

Mr. President, I wish to object very strenuously to the proposal that we in any way modify the present order prescribing certain uses of synthetic rubber.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I did not contemplate saying anything at all upon this subject, but I most respectfully disagree with the arguments which have just been advanced by the able Senator from Ohio. I think we have come to the time when we have to decide whether we are going to help some of the foreign countries to get dollars through encouraging multilateral trade in some way, which will undoubtedly require some sacrifices from us in our domestic economy, or are going to keep them going by giving them dollars by some sort of a grant arrangement.

Obviously there is a certain amount of sacrifice in either method, but I think we cannot, as a nation, look forward indefinitely to giving people outright grants of our dollars in order that they might buy something, without some form of trade being engaged in. Nor can we contemplate the possibility that we shall let their economies collapse. We simply have to live and let live, but America might as well recognize economically, in respect to foreign trade, that we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We have to pay something for the privilege of keeping other people in the world able to buy from us and able to trade with us, and able to help us maintain democratic institutions on the earth.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Florida has referred to the American policy of stimulating multilateral trade, which has been a long-existent policy of this Government, and has been urged in numerous communications from the State De-

partment and other public officials. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he noticed that, as a result of our dollar talks in Washington recently, it was agreed that \$175,000,000 of Marshall-plan money should be used to finance a bilateral trade agreement between Great Britain and Canada, executed in 1946, providing for the purchase of a large amount of Canadian wheat for sale to Great Britain. I should further like to ask the Senator from Florida whether he believes that we should sanction and finance a bilateral trade agreement of that kind.

Mr. PEPPER. There are individual hardship cases, of course, and we know that hard cases make bad law. There might be some question about the British using our dollars, furnished under the Marshall plan, to buy Canadian wheat, instead of buying American wheat, as of course we would all like to see them able to do. We would prefer, however, that they be able to buy American wheat with their own earned dollars, rather than dollars we give them. I do not know that we are netting any particular profit when we give them money with which to buy our wheat. At the same time, it must not be overlooked that the Canadians who get the dollars which come from the British purchasers probably will spend those dollars in the United States with some of our people. Possibly they are buying commodities from a large number of people in our country.

The able Senator knows, of course, that the Government does not regard it, and I certainly do not, as the ideal, but we confront a bad situation, and when we sometimes face a bad problem, we have to handle it in the best way we can. Taking the over-all picture into account, I do not believe the Government can be criticized for the honest and somewhat courageous and sacrificial effort it made recently to maintain these other countries which are essential to our kind of a world, and to look forward to the day when they can survive without our having to appropriate and give to them American money. We are looking forward to the day when they can support themselves.

Mr. KEM. That is a hope deferred.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wonder when the Senator expects that day will arrive.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not suppose any of us can with certainty know when that happy day will arrive, but we feel that it certainly will more probably come some day by some such sensible arrangement as that sought to be worked out recently, rather than by pouring money from our Treasury.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, does not the Senator also appreciate that while they are short of American dollars, they are short of their own dollars because of their methods of production and their socialization?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there are some other measures which we hope can be passed this afternoon, and I do not care to get far afield into another discussion, but I think it has generally been believed, and I believe it myself, that



Britain would have faced the dollar problem with which she is struggling if she had had Churchill instead of Attlee at the head of the Government, and a tory Government instead of a liberal Government. I do not know but that the nationalization which has taken place has probably helped them to meet the problem rather than worsened their ability. But that is a matter of opinion, and I have no right to assert that my opinion is more correct than that of the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, at the rate at which we are progressing, can the Senator give us any estimate as to the size of the American national debt at the time this happy day to which he looks forward arrives?

Mr. PEPPER. I venture to say that the size of the debt will be less if such methods as were adopted here recently in the conference are pursued than if we continue to support the economies of the foreign countries by grants from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. KEM. Can the Senator give any estimate as to what the debt will be at the present rate of progress and with a continuation of present policies?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know just what the Senator means by "the present rate." The Marshall plan is supposed to run until 1952, and the Senator knows as much as I do about what that plan contemplates over-all. Our other appropriations are made on a year-by-year basis. I do not know of any commitment we have. I do not think at the moment of any commitment we have for foreign aid, except a sort of moral commitment to carry through the Marshall plan up to 1952. The other appropriations are on a year-by-year basis, and what they will amount to will depend on what Congress does year by year.

Mr. KEM. Is it not generally recognized by students of the problem that our foreign friends will not be self-sufficient by 1952?

Mr. PEPPER. There has been some doubt about that, and no doubt the alarm about that matter has led to the action in the last few days in regard to the foreign aid. Instead of being faced in 1952 with the problem, what are we going to do? Are we going to start another Marshall plan, and appropriate more dollars, or are we going to start now to try to help the foreign countries to become self-sustaining by 1952?

Mr. KEM. Was there not a report from the council of the OEEC telling us that the participating countries under the Marshall plan will not be self-sustaining by 1952?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not understand that was a report from Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. KEM. The council of the OEEC.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is talking about the European council. They did make such an estimation, and they may be right. Certainly they are better off than they would have been without the Marshall plan, and we hope these later arrangements will make them better off than they are.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the Senator, he says that he would be willing to shut down a substantial number of these plants in order that the British may secure some dollars through the sale of Malayan rubber. Would the Senator go so far as to say that we ought to close down private plants employing American workmen by reducing the tariff to the point where those plants are put out of business entirely?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida did not make such a specific statement as has been just suggested by the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Florida meant to say that if we are going to stimulate and maintain multilateral trade in the world, if we are going to permit other countries to live and to be self-sustaining, we ourselves have to make certain sacrifices; that economically we cannot have our cake and eat it too; and that if it comes down to a problem of whether we have to make certain concessions by authorizing the President to enter into trade agreements which contemplate reasonable concessions on the part of members of our economy as an alternative to seeing those people abroad collapse, either as our purchasers or our allies, I prefer to see our economy seem to make what appears superficially to be certain sacrifices in the larger interests of a more prosperous world and a more prosperous country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Permit me to finish. If there are some synthetic-rubber plants in this country built by the United States Government during the war, as the able Senator admitted a moment ago when I made inquiry, and if it were a question of curtailing perhaps some of those plants as a means of stimulating the multilateral trade to which I refer, that may be a part of the price we have to pay for a democratic and a prosperous world. I do not know how the Senator from Ohio can expect to build a tariff wall around the United States, or expect no units of the American economy to make any sacrifices, and at the same time expect these people to survive as self-supporting economies, unless we are going to make up the deficit out of the Federal Treasury, which will mean that the private interests the Senator is solicitous about will simply have to pay more taxes than they otherwise would be obliged to pay.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, I have no desire to put up a tariff wall to prevent foreign goods from coming in on a fair basis of competition with goods manufactured in this country. But I do not think we should carry it to an extent of throwing out of work large numbers of American workmen, because I do not see how or where we are going to replace that work. It seems to me that that is the first essential to prevent unemployment in this country.

On this issue two questions are involved. The first is that we need the synthetic rubber for national defense, for

the national security, and the second is that we need it in order that it may be available for the constant development of new methods so as to perfect a product which, ultimately I think, will supersede raw rubber. We might as well face the fact now that that will require the importation perhaps of more oil into the United States instead of raw rubber. There are other things that will happen. But if we had never adopted the policy of protecting an industry which was gradually developing and for which we were trying to find new methods of development, we would never have built up the tremendous manufacturing industry we have in the United States and brought about the high standard of living and production we now have.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have seen nothing in the press and heard nothing by way of report, which indicates that our Government has made any commitment to close down the synthetic-rubber production of this country. There is simply an agreement to take a certain amount of raw rubber from abroad as a means of stimulating multilateral trade out of which the British and other countries could be able to become self-sufficient.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is mistaken. We did not agree to take any rubber from abroad. All we did agree to do, if we agreed to do anything, was to cut down the mandatory use of synthetic rubber, thereby necessarily closing down certain synthetic-rubber plants and reducing our production of synthetic rubber to the point where it will be more expensive, and the process of its development cannot be so great.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator said we agreed to waive the mandatory requirements that we use synthetic rubber.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. What did he mean? To allow our purchasers to enter into the market of natural rubber and bring it over here?

Mr. TAFT. We agreed to cut down the mandatory use of synthetic rubber something like 10 or 20 percent.

Mr. PEPPER. That was the subsidy for the synthetic-rubber industry in this country.

Mr. TAFT. No; it was not a subsidy. It was to keep these plants operating so that they would be ready, in case of war, to continue production and so that advantage could be gained from the technical developments which can occur only in actual use of this material, of the product itself. There has been a constant improvement during the past 5 years in the quality of the product, and the plants should be kept in operation in order that the process may continue to develop.

Mr. PEPPER. I can assure the Senator from Ohio, although I know he needs no such assurance, that the Commander in Chief of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and all those who are subordinate to the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, are going to take into

account the national security and the ability of our domestic production to furnish the things we may need for the sinews of our defense. I think we need not fear that those responsible leaders of our Government have been neglectful of those dominant interests of our safety and security.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am informed that the National Security Council and the people concerned about this proposal are absolutely opposed to it, but that the State Department is urging it upon them as a part of the foreign policy. The policy announced today does not strengthen the hands of those who are standing against this effort to weaken the national security of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator from Ohio that I am glad that he has chosen the forum of the Senate to attempt to aid some part of our Government that seems to be arguing with other parts of the Government regarding what is governmental policy or what should be governmental policy. I hope that we shall get an accurate report of the proceedings of the discussions here, and maybe through what the Senator has said today he will have served some good purpose. But I dare say that if there is a conflict between bureaus or departments of the Government the President of the United States will be called upon eventually to settle and to reconcile the conflict. I think the able Senator from Ohio can count upon it that the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy and the Air Force is no less solicitous than is the Senator for the strengthening of our national security and safety.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. One more statement. One other conclusion, whether it was in the actual report or not, is that by taking the proposed step we would increase the demand for raw rubber, and thereby increase the price of raw rubber, but that our failure to buy as much as is produced today has decreased the price. In other words, not only are we going to sacrifice our own plant but we are going to pay more for raw rubber. When we go back and look at the history of the Stevenson cartel, and the way we were held up for the price of raw rubber by the British and Dutch monopoly or combination that was made against us, it would appear that we are going a long way in unselfishness to invite them again to set the price we must pay for raw rubber, of which they have a practical monopoly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not believe it is the policy of the present administration to foment, to encourage, or to subsidize monopoly. I think the record of this administration, in the Congress and out of the Congress, has been clear on that subject, and that what has been done in this matter is not intended as in aid of or in furtherance of any monopoly in any part of the world.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has spoken fluently, as he always does, about the policy of encouraging Great Britain to set up a system of multilateral trade in a democratic world. I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks we are furthering such a policy when we encourage Great Britain to enter into bilateral trade agreements with Russia on the one hand and with the Argentine on the other?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the United States, fortunate as it is in its economy and capable of multilateral trade, should not be too unsympathetic with nations who do not have our economic strength, and therefore do not have the capacity of choice that we have. I suppose that if the British could get from us what they bought from Russia, and if they had the dollars with which to buy it they would prefer to buy from us. But does the Senator from Missouri want to vote more money and give Britain more dollars with which to buy in some other country other than our country? I do not suppose the Senator doubts that we have had our differences with Argentina and that our policies perhaps might not be in accord with the policies of the Argentine Government. But if the British people do not have any other source from which to get meat, and they make some arrangement with Argentina by which to get meat, I do not suppose the Senator from Missouri would say, "If you will not buy Argentine meat, I will give you American dollars with which to buy American meat." If the Senator will do that, I have no doubt that he will find willing and ready customers in England to receive both his dollars and our meat.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Missouri wishes to be recorded in the negative.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought I was correct in my prognosis of the Senator's position.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Florida believe that once in a while it is important to consider domestic conditions, instead of worrying about what is going to happen across the seas?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest to the Senator from Florida, with all due deference to what he has in mind—and I agree with him on many occasions—that he will not need to worry about what is happening with respect to cartels, rubber, or anything else if things go wrong within the United States. The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other members of the Committee on Public Works are trying to do something for the people of this country. I hope we can be allowed to proceed. I enjoy the discussion of these matters, which brings about so much debate, usually proves nothing, but, nevertheless, is entertaining. Will the Senator from Florida allow us to proceed?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from New Mexico does not quit speedily, he will

be the one who is retarding the passage of the bill. I am about to make a very few remarks, which will be the last. They will not hold up the pending measure.

#### ADVANCE PLANNING OF PUBLIC WORKS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2116) to provide for the advance of public works.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am not without interest in this subject. I certainly commend my distinguished junior colleague and the eminent chairman of the committee for what they have done in this field. The senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and I introduced a bill on June 27 of this year, looking in the same direction as the bill now before the Senate. We are both very grateful for the privilege of having our names on this measure.

What I rose to say, besides saying that I am strongly in favor of this measure and think it is a very sensible and wise measure against depression, is that the State superintendent of instruction of Florida telegraphed me as follows:

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., September 23, 1949.  
Senator CLAUDE PEPPER:

Please vote for Humphrey amendment to Senate bill 2116. Unless amended definitely oppose S. 2116 if schools included. Hope you can support S. 2317.

THOMAS D. BAILEY,  
State Superintendent.

There are many others in the school field who feel the same way as does our superintendent; but I want the RECORD to show that it is believed that it would be better to pass this bill in its present form than it would be to attempt at this time to amend it in the way the school people feel it should be amended.

However, I wish to state at this time that I am in hearty accord with Senate bill 2317. I commend the distinguished majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] as chairman of the Policy Committee, for the announcement that that bill will be put upon the agenda of measures to be considered before the Congress adjourns. I believe that it is preferable for the school planning survey to be under the jurisdiction of the school authorities. I do not understand that the advocates of this measure oppose such a principle. Some of them, I am confident, are for Senate bill 2317; but they naturally feel that since we do not have Senate bill 2317 before us at the present time, we should go ahead with the bill as it is; and I concur in that sentiment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the advance planning of non-Federal public works."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Pennsylvania senior Senator [Mr. MYERS], who is unavoidably detained from the Senate today, is vitally interested in the passage of the legislation to renew the highly successful advance planning program, a program for which he has fought



long and hard over the years. He took a very active part in the Seventy-ninth Congress in helping to get through the initial appropriations to get this program under way.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania discussed the merits of this bill at some length in a radio address he made to the people of Pennsylvania in his bi-weekly series of talks over Pennsylvania radio stations during the weekend of August 19 to 21 inclusive.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the relevant portions of that address, plus some additional material prepared by him, including a detailed break-down of all of the individual projects in Pennsylvania which figured in the previous program, which this bill would renew, including those which are already under construction and on which the advances of funds for planning purposes have been repaid, showing the locations, type of work, and also similar break-downs on other projects on which planning is completed, and a third group consisting of projects on which planning is not yet completed. A fourth table gives a statistical summary.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN BEHALF OF S. 2116 TO RENEW THE PROGRAM OF ADVANCE PLANNING OF PUBLIC WORKS BY LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND TO AUTHORIZE FEDERAL FUNDS OF \$100,000,000 FOR THIS PURPOSE**

The excerpts which follow from the radio address I made on this subject several weeks ago cover, in essential form, the importance of this program to the individual communities which have already benefited from it, and indicates in a general way what it will mean to all communities in the State when the fund is reestablished.

There is one very important aspect of this whole matter which was not covered in that radio address because of limitations of time, and it is this:

These loans are designed to put our communities in a position to undertake at a moment's notice necessary long-range public works improvements the construction of which may become immediately advisable in order to provide employment opportunities at a time of economic dislocation or stress.

The necessity for this kind of foresighted mobilization of our resources against depression before depression hits is demonstrated by the experience we had in the pit of the depression when spending programs designed to put people to work very often turned out to be leaf-raking projects and others of no long-range benefit to the community. Much that WPA and other early emergency agencies did was of tremendous long-range value, but only in those instances where the local community had plans which could be used for worth while construction work.

It was testified before the House Committee on Public Works earlier this year on similar legislation that despite the availability of nearly \$3,500,000,000 in 1933 for emergency public works to provide employment, it took 18 months to get a mere 100,000 men at work on project sites because of the absence of plans and specifications in advance for this construction work. And, as that witness testified, that was where the made work program was born. Planning in advance would have prevented just about all of the useless projects of those days, and the money we spent would have gone a whole lot further in providing us with enduring and useful community needs.

There is another important aspect of the need for this type of fund. It might well be asked why the local communities themselves do not go ahead and use their own funds for planning work of this kind, particularly since they have to repay the loans we will make under this program whenever they actually start construction on the projects for which they get the advances. The answer to that is quite simple:

Most communities finance their major public improvements through bond issues voted on by the people. The bond issues, once voted, provide the funds not only to do the actual construction work but to do such incidental and necessary work as the engineering planning. Until the bond issue is floated, however, the community in most cases does not have the funds to pay for plans and specifications. By advancing them this money in the form of loans, we enable them to proceed with their planning work at any time, removing the necessity for delay on the planning until the entire project is ready to go into construction.

At the end of this statement appears a break-down showing how many Pennsylvania communities have already repaid the loans which were advanced to them under the previous program, repaid them because they have now placed in construction the projects for which the loans were granted. In individual cases, this work could not today be progressing at the rate it is if these loans had not been made when they were.

The break-down also shows projects in Pennsylvania communities which are now ready for construction because planning work is completed under a loan made by the Federal Government. Another list shows those projects which are now in the planning stage. A fourth listing gives a statistical summary including the number of projects for which loans were requested but for which no funds were available. These tables show graphically the full extent of the operation of the original program in Pennsylvania.

Here is what I said about this program on my radio broadcast of several weeks ago:

**"ADVANCE PLANNING OF NECESSARY LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS"**

"In my previous broadcast 2 weeks ago, I said I would today discuss a matter of great importance to every community in Pennsylvania. I think I had better get to that subject now. It is a bill now before both Houses of Congress to spend \$100,000,000 of Federal funds—a sore point, perhaps, among some of my listeners who are already severely disturbed by the amount of Government spending which we are now doing.

"This bill, however, is in a somewhat different grouping from the so-called wasteful and extravagant categories in which so much of our Federal expenditures are placed by critics of the administration. This is money which will, in most instances, come back to the Government in full.

"The bill I am referring to, recently reported out favorably by the Senate Public Works Committee—incidentally, with bipartisan support—would authorize the establishment of a new fund of \$100,000,000 to be available to communities all over the Nation as loans for advance planning on necessary public construction work, on highways, sewers, bridges, schools, municipal buildings, and numerous other local public works.

"So that there will be no misunderstanding of the purpose of this program, I think I had better repeat that these are loans—not grants—for engineering planning work—not for construction work, not for a new WPA or PWA, but for drafting of plans and specifications only. There is absolutely no commitment that the Federal Government now—or in the future—intends to pay any part of the construction costs of these projects.

"This is not a new and untried program. Shortly before the end of the war in our historic War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 a program of this sort was first authorized. The following year, when the appropriation for it came up, the House allowed only \$5,000,000 instead of the sixty-five million requested by the administration. One of my first fights in the Senate was in behalf of the full appropriation, which we finally succeeded in getting piecemeal in three separate appropriation bills over a period of 2 years. That money, just about all of it, has been used for the purposes we intended. The program expired in mid-1947, and the Eightieth Congress refused to renew it, unfortunately.

"As a result of that refusal, numerous communities in Pennsylvania were left out in the cold in their efforts to obtain loans for the planning of schools, sewers, bridge improvements, water systems and other necessary, although not immediately urgent, public works. This was particularly true in Luzerne, Lackawanna, and Schuylkill Counties, three of the worst unemployment areas in the State today, where any efforts to create employment through the construction of these necessary facilities would be handicapped now by the failure to have complete plans ready to use.

"On the other hand, the records show, that out of the \$65,000,000 made available in 1945 and 1946 school districts in Philadelphia, Punxsutawney, Homestead, Lancaster, and elsewhere have been able not only to plan new buildings, but to start actual construction on them and have paid in full the loans which the Government made. For about a quarter of a million dollars in such loans, these communities, and others, with water or sewer projects under way, were able to plan construction work valued at nearly \$20,000,000.

"Furthermore, an additional \$203,000,000 worth of construction work, bridges and sewers in Harrisburg, streets and sewers and playgrounds in Pittsburgh, a city hall in Williamsport, and sewage disposal systems in cities and towns along all of our rivers, is all completely planned and ready to go into construction, practically tomorrow. These plans cost a little over \$2,000,000. Other advance planning loans totaling a million and a half are being devoted now to similar work in towns like Allentown, Chambersburg, Blairsville, Dubois, Charleroi, Doylestown, Monessen, and many others.

"Almost every community in the State which is conforming to the State's anti-stream-pollution laws has been able to do so only because of the availability of this fund in the past few years in providing money for the necessary preliminary planning work.

"So here is a case of Federal expenditure, of Federal spending, which we seldom think of when we denounce Government spending as such, and yet it is typical of many programs now in our budget, which cost the Government money, but which are in fact investments in a better America, and pay us back manyfold, not only in value received, but in this one program at least, will pay us back virtually dollar for dollar.

"A \$2,000,000 sanitation system in Johnstown, a half-million dollar sewage system in Clearfield, 5 schools in Allentown (which will cost about \$3,500,000), Wilkes-Barre's \$3,000,000 sewage system, and a similar one in Harrisburg, a \$7,500,000 one in Scranton, nearly \$8,000,000 worth of school construction in Philadelphia—these are sorts of projects to be paid for locally which are speeded toward the construction stage by the Federal program we have had in the past.

"When, as, and if this new bill is passed, and I hope it will be soon, your own community, if it did not do so the last time, or was unable to qualify in the previous program because there were insufficient funds available, should be on its toes and apply early."

OPERATION OF THE FEDERAL FUND FOR ADVANCE PLANNING OF LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS IN PENNSYLVANIA FROM 1945 TO ITS EXPIRATION IN MID-1947

TABLE 1.—Estimated cost of proposed public works for the State of Pennsylvania for which advances for plan preparation have been repaid, June 30, 1949

Applicant	Location	Type of work	Serial No.	Amount of advance	Total public work cost
Nethr. Pr. Township school district	Wallingford	School	1	\$13,006	\$378,417
School district	Philadelphia	do.	2	47,000	3,834,445
Do.	do.	do.	3	75,000	7,755,400
Do.	Springfield Township	do.	7	1,300	60,772
Jefferson Township school district	Pleasant Hills	do.	18	4,070	116,500
Borough Township	Borough Township	do.	45	1,050	68,700
King Township school district	Imler	do.	51	684	31,502
School district	Somerset	do.	95	1,278	128,577
Do.	Abington Township	do.	115	4,150	237,100
Do.	Punxsutawney	do.	162	4,000	287,745
Du Bois	Du Bois	Safety building	165	657	78,573
School district	Homestead	School	184	1,970	145,177
Do.	do.	do.	185	1,900	190,997
Landsdale	Landsdale	do.	210	700	72,380
School district	Philadelphia	do.	217	10,000	838,400
Do.	Lancaster	do.	243	1,825	191,838
Do.	Turtle Creek	do.	254	6,000	185,250
Do.	Concord Township	do.	259	4,300	125,080
Jacobus	Jacobus	Water	266	775	76,850
School district	Aston Township	School	280	2,025	106,840
Flemington	Flemington	Sewer	288	3,800	120,473
Bridgeville	Bridgeville	City hall	336	2,000	133,000
Jersey Shore	Jersey Shore	Sewer	346	625	258,670
Allentown	Allentown	Water	347	31,000	3,000,000
Upper Southampton Township	Upper Southampton Township	do.	363	4,012	146,306
Total (25)				223,217	18,568,992

TABLE 2.—Estimated cost of proposed public works for the State of Pennsylvania for which plan preparation has been completed, June 30, 1949

Applicant	Location	Type of work	Serial No.	Amount of advance	Total public work cost
School district	Philadelphia	School	4	\$37,500	\$7,658,200
Lewistown	Lewistown	Sewer	5	8,000	840,682
Beaver	do.	do.	6	6,000	480,000
School district	Bristol	School	10	11,880	345,710
Do.	Prospect Park	do.	11	4,850	151,520
Marple Township school district	Broomall	do.	12	7,900	235,260
School district	Darby	do.	13	5,840	167,913
Glen Norwood school district	Glenolden	do.	14	9,240	251,451
Greensburg	Greensburg	Sewer	15	14,781	1,372,798
Beaver	Beaver	Water	16	4,000	153,660
School district	Jefferson Township	School	19	8,300	312,000
Ridley Township school district	Folsom	do.	23	10,080	302,540
Harrisburg	Harrisburg	Miscellaneous building	24	450	27,230
Do.	do.	Bridge	25	1,300	35,000
Do.	do.	Miscellaneous building	26	750	40,000
Do.	do.	Sewer	27	65,000	3,250,193
Do.	do.	Miscellaneous recreation	28	2,700	477,500
Do.	do.	Bridge	29	1,040	39,900
Barnesboro	Barnesboro	Water	31	4,050	123,530
Chester Township school district	Fentonville	School	38	1,965	65,662
Patterson Heights	Patterson Heights	Street	39	1,125	65,948
New Brighton	New Brighton	Sewer	40	9,564	246,671
Rochester	Rochester	do.	44	5,000	315,677
Crescent Township	Crescent Township	Water	47	2,400	161,950
School district	Bristol	School	48	13,000	437,100
Upper Moreland Township	Upper Moreland Township	City hall	50	2,400	96,446
Harmony	Harmony	Sewer	52	375	27,572
Upper Moreland Township	Upper Moreland Township	Sanitation	54	1,000	33,815
Do.	do.	Sewer	55	4,200	174,265
Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	Garage	58	18,900	585,000
Do.	do.	Sewer	60	4,620	92,100
Do.	do.	Administration building	61	4,938	200,000
Do.	do.	do.	62	5,786	225,000
Do.	do.	Sewer	64	4,865	117,717
Do.	do.	do.	65	702	52,418
Do.	do.	do.	66	11,800	349,129
Do.	do.	Street	67	2,004	87,000
Do.	do.	do.	68	6,165	135,000
Do.	do.	do.	69	2,265	88,000
Do.	do.	Sewer	70	9,080	345,190
Bensalem Township school district	Area-wide	School	73	5,400	432,800
School district	Bridgeport	do.	74	6,000	183,214
Ambridge	Ambridge	Sewer	77	10,312	711,367
Freedom	Freedom	do.	78	1,800	132,331
Northumberland	Northumberland	do.	79	1,000	102,318
Upper Chichester school district	Upper Chichester Township	School	80	3,960	119,987
School district	Norwood	do.	82	2,400	85,912
Marple and NTN Township school district	Larchmont	do.	84	6,400	209,707
Northampton County	Nazareth Township	Penal welfare	85	30,800	1,792,500
School district	Morrisville	School	88	5,200	161,200
Chartiers Township school district	Washington	do.	94	2,250	85,850
School district	Upland	do.	96	2,300	70,079
Patterson Township	Patterson Township	Street	98	2,000	40,500
School district	Baldwin Township	School	99	4,446	255,120
Do.	do.	do.	104	4,184	240,380
Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh	Playground	111	5,438	93,000
Do.	do.	Street	113	4,600	211,000
Do.	do.	do.	114	3,440	113,700
Du Bois	Du Bois	Sewer	118	12,500	468,378
School district	Darby	School	121	6,000	250,000
Mount Union	Mount Union	Sewer	122	2,300	252,370
School district	Arnold	School	123	12,000	735,000
Do.	Phoenixville	do.	125	7,200	239,000
Do.	Hellertown	do.	126	4,160	123,960
Lycoming County	Williamsport	City hall	127	41,663	2,372,000
Evansburg	Evansburg	Sewer	131	500	20,615



TABLE 2.—Estimated cost of proposed public works for the State of Pennsylvania for which plan preparation has been completed, June 30, 1949—Continued

Applicant	Location	Type of work	Serial No.	Amount of advance	Total public work cost
South Williamsport	South Williamsport	Sewer	137	\$4,000	\$267,000
School district	Warren	School	140	8,680	433,140
Muncy and Muncy Creek school district	Muncy	do	143	4,160	241,820
Harford Township school district	Harford	do	146	2,700	92,708
Williamsburg	Williamsburg	Water	152	7,155	230,335
Bradford	Bradford	Sewer	164	9,000	957,030
School district	Versailles Township	School	169	13,800	396,500
Blakely	Blakely	Sewer	172	246	14,300
do	do	do	173	434	30,500
do	do	Street	175	520	43,002
Newport Township school district	Wanamie	School	179	920	24,480
Northampton	Northampton	Sewer	183	4,000	150,000
School district	Hathboro	School	189	3,255	95,250
do	do	do	190	1,600	59,155
Smith Township school district	Joffre	do	192	2,689	154,950
do	Atlasburg	do	193	1,493	85,050
School district	Kutztown	do	203	4,000	148,100
Tyrone	Tyrone	Sewer	204	5,000	443,360
Aliquippa	Aliquippa	do	208	17,324	950,000
Mechanicsburg	Mechanicsburg	do	209	2,000	251,200
Ashland	Ashland	do	212	10,000	442,400
Shippensburg	Shippensburg	do	213	22,000	728,100
Huntingdon	Huntingdon	do	214	20,000	732,548
Allegheny County	County-wide	do	215	150,000	\$1,052,000
Logan Township	Logan Township	do	218	4,112	320,252
Blakely	Blakely	do	219	9,500	450,295
Lackawanna Township	Lackawanna Township	do	221	10,700	353,973
Wilkes-Barre	Wilkes-Barre	do	234	41,000	3,181,817
Throop	Throop	do	235	774	71,557
do	do	Street	236	1,399	85,600
Hamburg	Hamburg	Sewer	239	17,172	645,000
Lock Haven	Lock Haven	do	240	10,000	468,796
do	do	do	241	7,000	311,996
Hyndman	Hyndman	do	242	4,200	163,638
Williamsport	Williamsport	do	244	40,000	2,272,000
Curwensville	Curwensville	do	245	7,000	294,711
Pottstown	Pottstown	do	248	10,000	646,500
Muncy	Muncy	do	249	2,580	134,317
Reading	Reading	Miscellaneous recreation	251	20,000	655,684
Bellwood	Bellwood	Sewer	253	738	57,500
School district	Wilkes-Barre	School	255	30,600	3,125,000
Mifflinburg Borough	Mifflinburg	Sewer	256	3,334	236,203
Hatfield Borough	Hatfield	do	257	2,375	483,900
Jersey Shore	Jersey Shore	do	258	6,118	160,253
Monaca	Monaca	do	260	6,300	413,500
Norwood	Norwood	City Hall	261	2,250	58,413
Phoenixville	Phoenixville	Sewer	262	3,000	475,561
do	do	Water	263	1,300	102,294
Plains Township	Plains Township	Sewer	264	47,000	1,572,459
Nanticoke	Nanticoke	do	265	23,438	1,146,000
Avis	Avis	do	267	4,600	164,368
Loyalsock Township	Loyalsock Township	do	268	5,520	253,000
Pittston Township	Pittston Township	do	269	8,850	471,204
Duryea	Duryea	do	270	13,750	548,613
Jenkins Township	Jenkins Township	do	271	15,450	865,643
Avoca	Avoca	do	272	10,250	504,143
Exeter	Exeter	do	273	11,500	832,045
Hughestown	Hughestown	do	274	1,300	184,485
Dupont	Dupont	do	275	15,050	900,085
Pittston	Pittston	do	279	22,600	1,179,812
Lemoine	Lemoine	do	281	18,000	747,491
Chester	Chester	Water	282	179,480	13,141,500
East Stroudsburg	East Stroudsburg	Sewer	283	7,000	1,709,200
Mill Hall	Mill Hall	do	284	5,000	238,118
Baden	Baden	do	286	5,300	220,398
Punxsutawney	Punxsutawney	do	289	7,375	287,084
Duncannon	Duncannon	do	290	1,200	221,965
Gettysburg	Gettysburg	do	291	1,450	224,464
York	York	do	292	20,000	2,858,875
Sheffield Township	Sheffield Township	do	293	2,500	199,000
Freeport	Freeport	do	294	1,238	160,000
West Newton	West Newton	do	295	2,100	180,000
Brookville	Brookville	do	296	3,700	200,000
Honesdale	Honesdale	do	297	8,000	859,500
Latrobe	Latrobe	do	299	12,000	597,544
South Coatsville	South Coatsville	do	302	3,450	299,357
Spring Grove	Spring Grove	do	303	4,750	296,449
Morrisville	Morrisville	do	304	8,900	1,555,818
Abington Township	Abington Township	Safety building	308	8,400	96,350
Connellsville	Connellsville	Sewer	309	14,800	470,000
Shamokin Dam	Shamokin Dam	do	310	975	110,285
do	do	Water	311	975	77,330
New Oxford	New Oxford	do	312	2,200	83,804
Bloomsburg	Bloomsburg	Sewer	313	12,000	732,893
School district	Walnutport	School	314	1,950	65,255
Athens	Athens	Sewer	315	14,000	668,176
Coudersport	Coudersport	do	316	7,200	402,909
Catawissa	Catawissa	do	319	4,000	107,185
Derry	Derry	do	320	1,000	57,000
Berwick	Berwick	do	322	3,750	472,988
Columbia	Columbia	do	323	6,454	410,009
North Warren	North Warren	Water	324	3,000	90,000
Mansfield	Mansfield	Sewer	325	2,000	108,479
Donora	Donora	do	328	15,200	704,000
Carmichaels	Carmichaels	Water	329	5,681	180,000
Orbisonia	Orbisonia	Sewer	330	1,050	152,552
Canton	Canton	do	332	9,541	359,740
Marysville	Marysville	do	333	3,200	119,046
White Haven	White Haven	do	334	3,500	128,456
Neville Township	Neville Township	Street	339	11,930	395,455
New Eagle	New Eagle	Sewer	340	6,000	288,044
Scottsdale	Scottsdale	do	343	13,400	640,000
West Pittston	West Pittston	do	344	3,500	194,245
Jersey Shore	Jersey Shore	do	345	500	42,470
Dauphin	Dauphin	do	348	950	42,146
Brentwood	Brentwood	Safety building	350	6,000	240,650

TABLE 2.—Estimated cost of proposed public works for the State of Pennsylvania for which plan preparation has been completed, June 30, 1949—Continued

Applicant	Location	Type of work	Serial No.	Amount of advance	Total public work cost
Ford City	Ford City	Sewer	351	\$14,900	\$553,000
Bridgeport	Bridgeport	do	352	4,550	232,932
Monongahela	Monongahela	do	353	11,976	564,248
Delaware County	Ridley Township	do	354	2,700	93,400
Nescopeck	Nescopeck	do	355	1,100	101,666
Meyersdale	Meyersdale	do	356	2,906	80,636
School district	Media	School	357	8,150	234,209
Do	Trainer	do	358	4,200	127,579
Spring Garden Township	Spring Garden Township	Sewer	360	3,700	203,089
Sayre	Sayre	do	361	4,900	272,216
Washington	Washington	do	362	32,340	1,886,000
Springetsbry Township	Springetsbry Township	do	363	2,600	169,388
Seranton	Seranton	do	364	170,000	7,560,417
Ligonier	Ligonier	do	368	2,000	197,000
Saegerstown	Saegerstown	do	370	1,905	83,399
Schuylkill Haven	Schuylkill Haven	do	372	12,500	857,446
Cornplanter Township	Cornplanter Township	do	374	4,500	278,579
Middlebury	Middlebury	do	378	6,500	294,646
School district	Patton Township	School	382	6,750	500,560
Catasauqua	Catasauqua	Sewer	384	19,000	654,077
Hazleton	Hazleton	do	386	35,000	1,693,985
B. Vernon, et al.	Belle Vernon	do	387	9,395	500,000
Plymouth	Plymouth	do	388	11,250	614,848
Norristown	Norristown	do	389	15,250	1,871,643
Johnstown	Johnstown	Sewer, water, sanitation	391	35,100	1,745,115
Lehigh	Lehigh	Sewer	394	4,600	1,120,000
Milton	Milton	do	395	6,500	445,750
Midland	Midland	do	396	3,930	230,714
Greenville	Greenville	do	399	3,700	171,030
Plymouth Township	Plymouth Township	do	401	7,700	325,309
Pleasantville	Pleasantville	do	405	700	31,235
Steelton	Steelton	do	407	8,250	559,958
Belle Vernon	Belle Vernon	School	408	1,680	66,248
Wyatung	Wyatung	Sewer	409	1,203	30,085
Do	do	do	410	1,625	118,410
Masontown	Masontown	do	411	10,500	404,500
Harrisville	Harrisville	Water	412	1,550	103,050
North York	North York	Sewer	413	4,650	167,211
Titusville	Titusville	do	414	4,800	424,000
Danville	Danville	do	415	4,800	286,529
Mount Wolf	Mount Wolf	do	416	3,850	239,631
Taylor	Taylor	do	419	19,600	545,504
Shillington	Shillington	do	421	19,349	876,740
Millersburg	Millersburg	do	422	2,160	166,476
Wyoming	Wyoming	do	424	8,500	376,971
Matamoras	Matamoras	do	429	7,300	649,650
Glen Rock	Glen Rock	do	434	8,000	317,310
Clearfield	Clearfield	do	437	5,650	182,355
Do	do	do	438	8,000	320,989
Do	do	do	439	1,400	45,035
Cressona	Cressona	do	440	9,100	344,489
Palmer Township school district	Easton	School	441	12,751	290,851
Seranton	Seranton	Bridge	442	1,000	43,610
Laureldale	Laureldale	Sewer	495	9,249	642,384
Total (226)				2,275,080	203,792,043

TABLE 3.—Estimated cost of proposed public works for the State of Pennsylvania for which planning advances have been approved and plan preparation has not been completed, June 30, 1949

Applicant	Location	Type of work	Serial No.	Amount of advance	Total public work cost
Wilson school district	Easton	School	9	\$8,750	\$270,000
School district	Penn Township	do	17	25,965	613,920
Oil City	Oil City	Miscellaneous facilities	20	29,000	900,000
Harrisburg	Harrisburg	Miscellaneous recreation	30	2,250	47,550
School district	Allentown	School	32	28,700	880,000
Do	do	do	33	7,525	230,000
Do	do	do	34	7,350	225,000
Do	do	do	35	20,300	665,000
Do	do	do	36	48,300	1,500,000
Do	Tyrone	do	37	6,300	197,500
Green Tree	Lewistown	do	42	5,240	150,240
Pittsburgh	Green Tree	Sewer	46	10,000	262,500
Do	Pittsburgh	Administration building	63	5,800	169,350
Do	do	Bridge	71	24,000	713,000
School district	do	do	72	22,400	665,000
Blair County	Beaver	School	90	4,320	254,820
Do	County-wide	Penal welfare	91	10,800	375,000
School district	Holidaysburg	Courthouse	92	7,200	240,000
Pittsburgh	Baldwin Township	School	100	14,810	430,035
Do	Pittsburgh	Miscellaneous recreation	107	30,240	520,160
Do	do	Playground	108	14,070	242,130
Do	do	Miscellaneous recreation	109	7,080	141,160
Do	do	Playground	110	13,440	230,960
Elizabeth Township school district	Greenock	School	117	10,650	293,775
Hilltown Township school district	Blooming Glen	do	119	4,560	121,340
Hopewell Township	Hopewell Township	Sewer	120	2,500	179,000
School district	Chambersburg	School	128	20,000	525,000
Point Marion	Point Marion	Miscellaneous recreation	130	1,500	53,500
School district	West Mifflin	School	132	9,640	540,000
Blairsville	Blairsville	Safety building	147	1,500	53,300
Do	do	City hall	149	200	10,000
School districts	Albion	School	151	2,200	145,000
School district	Morton	do	163	1,400	37,600
Du Bois	Du Bois	City hall	166	613	24,994
Avonworth Union school district	Ben Avon	School	167	16,038	548,600
Blakely	Blakely	Street	171	205	11,090
Do	do	Sewer	174	150	8,275



TABLE 3.—Estimated cost of proposed public works for the State of Pennsylvania for which planning advances have been approved and plan preparation has not been completed, June 30, 1949—Continued

Applicant	Location	Type of work	Serial No.	Amount of advance	Total public work cost
Girard Junction school district.....	Girard.....	School.....	177	\$1,133	\$27,275
Northampton.....	Northampton.....	Miscellaneous recreation.....	181	3,000	160,000
School district.....	Jermyn.....	School.....	182	1,688	106,125
Do.....	Homestead.....	do.....	186	1,040	27,969
Do.....	do.....	do.....	187	10,400	177,609
Do.....	West Reading.....	do.....	188	10,000	332,750
Do.....	Downington.....	do.....	196	4,600	125,000
Landsdale.....	Landsdale.....	do.....	202	5,000	159,100
Whitaker.....	Whitaker.....	City hall.....	205	1,620	45,000
Do.....	do.....	Street.....	206	1,400	57,600
Do.....	do.....	Sewer.....	207	1,500	38,000
School District.....	Moon Township.....	School.....	222	9,600	343,000
Philadelphia.....	Philadelphia.....	Hospital.....	223	131,000	4,401,000
Do.....	do.....	Nurses' home.....	224	26,000	72,000
Do.....	do.....	Hospital.....	225	15,600	464,900
Do.....	do.....	Nurses' home.....	226	12,200	407,000
Do.....	do.....	Hospital.....	227	1,000	37,500
Do.....	do.....	Health facilities.....	228	6,400	243,400
Do.....	do.....	Hospital.....	229	12,800	435,800
Do.....	do.....	Penal welfare.....	230	8,000	270,000
Do.....	do.....	do.....	231	40,000	1,345,300
Do.....	do.....	do.....	232	98,000	3,013,000
Blakely.....	Blakely.....	Electric facilities.....	287	20,000	445,000
Allegheny County.....	County-wide.....	Penal welfare.....	300	222,600	6,000,000
Charleroi.....	Charleroi.....	Water.....	301	5,000	220,000
School district.....	Manheim.....	School.....	327	6,000	138,000
Conway.....	Conway.....	Sewer.....	335	2,900	76,900
West Wyoming.....	West Wyoming.....	do.....	337	8,050	220,853
Jefferson Township.....	Jefferson Township.....	City hall.....	338	800	17,550
Tunkhannock.....	Tunkhannock.....	Sewer.....	359	7,000	180,000
School districts, 8 townships.....	North Quarryville.....	School.....	365	12,600	325,700
Wormleysburg.....	Wormleysburg.....	Sewer.....	366	3,150	119,950
School district.....	East Norriton Township.....	School.....	371	1,250	27,630
Bucks County.....	Doyletstown.....	do.....	377	24,000	873,000
California.....	California.....	Sewer.....	381	4,600	139,080
Monessen.....	Monessen.....	do.....	390	31,800	1,038,000
Pittsburgh.....	Pittsburgh.....	Miscellaneous facilities.....	393	250,000	6,550,000
Charleroi.....	Charleroi.....	Sewer.....	402	17,550	495,550
Brownsville.....	Brownsville.....	do.....	404	16,200	478,200
North Charleroi.....	North Charleroi.....	do.....	418	4,800	143,790
Total (77).....				1,465,284	42,940,321

TABLE 4.—Advance planning program—Summary of applications for the State of Pennsylvania, June 30, 1949

Status	Number	Amount of advance	Total estimated cost <sup>1</sup>
Advances approved, plans not completed.....	77	\$1,465,284	\$42,940,321
Advances approved, plans completed.....	226	2,275,080	203,792,043
Advances repaid, projects under construction.....	25	223,217	18,568,992
Total advances approved.....	328	3,963,581	265,301,356
Applications deferred due to expiration of authority or funds.....	118	1,366,938	42,872,460
Advances canceled July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1949.....	4	24,800	710,675

<sup>1</sup> Costs increased 25 percent since June 30, 1947.

## POSTMASTER AT SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if it is satisfactory to the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and I can secure unanimous consent, I should like to ask for the consideration and confirmation of the nomination of William E. Krenning to be postmaster at San Diego, Calif. My beloved colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], has heretofore prevented confirmation of this nomination. I understand that he desires to make a very brief statement of his position with respect to the nomination. It will require only a short time. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for the present consideration of that nomination.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader

a question. As I understand, if we are to go into executive session, we shall take up the California postmaster nomination, and the nomination of collectors of customs in Alabama and Louisiana, and none of the other nominations will be considered until Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct; but before we take up the Executive Calendar, I gave notice the other day that we would take up another bill on the Legislative Calendar. If the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] will subside for a few moments I think we can pass that bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the word "subside" I happily yield to the wishes of the majority leader. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to substitute a different word when I edit my remarks, if the Senator objects to the word "subside."

## FEDERAL AID FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President will the Senator from Illinois allow me to make a unanimous-consent request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 840, Senate bill 1453, the medical education bill which was referred to yesterday?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 840, Senate bill 1453, which was unanimously reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection. I understand that the bill was unanimously reported from the committee, and that there will be very little discussion.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1453) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants and scholarships for education in the medical, dental, dental hygiene, public health, nursing, and sanitary engineering professions, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. Title III of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A, subch. II), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART II—ASSISTANCE FOR THE EDUCATION OF PROFESSIONAL AND OTHER HEALTH PERSONNEL

## "DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 371. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

"(a) there is a shortage of physicians, dentists, dental hygienists, nurses, and other health personnel (including hospital administrators) essential to maintaining and improving the Nation's health and this shortage is likely to increase unless present facilities

and opportunities for training such personnel are strengthened and expanded.

"(b) the cost of providing adequate professional training, and facilities therefor, is so high and the sources of income for schools affording such training are so limited as to render it impossible for such schools to operate at present capacity on a financially sound basis, and as to discourage the construction and equipment of new schools and the expansion of existing schools necessary to relieve the shortage of professionally trained personnel;

"(c) it is, therefore, the policy of the United States to take such steps and to utilize such of its resources as are necessary to provide adequate numbers of individuals trained in the medical, osteopathic, nursing, dental, dental hygiene, hospital administration, and public-health professions (1) by assisting schools which provide such training in meeting their costs of instruction and by giving financial assistance for the construction and equipment of new schools and for the improvement and expansion of existing schools, with a view to providing opportunities for qualified individuals to obtain such training, and (2) by providing scholarships to induce greater numbers of qualified students to train for such professions; and

"(d) it is also the policy of the United States that the financial assistance made available to schools under this part shall be used to supplement, and not to replace, their existing income and resources.

#### "PAYMENTS TO SCHOOLS FOR COSTS OF INSTRUCTION

"Sec. 372. (a) In order to assist schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, nursing, and public health, to maintain and increase their enrollments of students, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to make the payments provided in this section. Payments to schools from appropriations under this section may be used to meet the costs (herein referred to as 'costs of instruction') of establishing, maintaining, and enlarging their staffs and of maintaining and operating their facilities (including the acquisition of equipment).

"(b) Payments to schools for any fiscal year shall be based on the number of students enrolled therein for such fiscal year as follows:

"(1) to each school of medicine or osteopathy which provides training leading to a degree of doctor of medicine or osteopathy, \$500 for each student enrolled for such training, and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$500 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment;

"(2) (A) to each school of dentistry which provides training leading to a degree of doctor of dental surgery or an equivalent degree, \$400 for each student enrolled for such training, and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$400 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment, and (B) to each school of dental hygiene which provides training leading to a diploma or degree as dental hygienist, \$150 for each student enrolled for such training, and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$150 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment;

"(3) (A) to each university-controlled or college-controlled school of nursing which provides basic or advanced training in nursing for which it grants a baccalaureate or higher degree, \$200 for each student enrolled for such training, and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$200 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment; (B) to each

school of nursing which provides basic training leading to a diploma as a professional nurse, \$150 for each student enrolled for such training, and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$100 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment; and (C) to each school of practical nursing which provides training leading to a certificate or diploma as a practical nurse, and which is not eligible for aid under title II of the Vocational Educational Act of 1946, as amended, \$100 for each student enrolled for such training and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$50 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General may, by regulation, permit payments to a school under clause (B) or (C) to be used by such school for scholarships to students in such amounts, for such expenses, and under such conditions as he finds, after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the National Council on Education for Health Professions (hereafter in this part called the 'Council'), to be reasonable in the light of past practices at such school;

"(4) to each school of public health which provides training leading to a graduate degree in fields relating to public health (which may include training leading to a graduate degree in hospital administration), \$1,000 for each student enrolled for such training, and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$1,000 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment.

The total payment to any school pursuant to this section for any fiscal year (excluding, in the case of diploma schools of nursing and schools of practical nursing, payments used by such schools for scholarship aid as authorized in clause (3) of this subsection) shall not exceed 40 percent of the amount determined by the Surgeon General to be costs of instruction in such school for such year (excluding from such costs, the cost of special training projects which are outside the school's regular curriculum and are financed through public or private grants made specifically for such projects, the cost of operation of any hospital, and the cost of research projects).

"(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, the number of students enrolled for training in any school which shall be counted for any fiscal year as 'enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment' for purposes of subsection (b) shall be the sum of the numbers by which the enrollment in each year class exceeds the average past enrollment in such class, except that (A) the number so counted for any fiscal year in any class except a first-year class shall not exceed the number so counted in the next lower year class for the preceding fiscal year, and (B) the total number so counted in any first-year class shall not exceed 30 percent of the average past enrollment in such class.

"(2) The average past enrollment in any year class shall be the average of enrollments in such class for the period consisting of the three fiscal years ending June 30, 1947, June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949, except that if training in a year class was not provided by a school during one or two of the fiscal years in such period, such fiscal year or years shall be excluded in determining the average past enrollment in such class.

"(3) If training in a year class was not provided by a school during any of the three fiscal years ending June 30, 1947, June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949, but is provided by the school during any fiscal year for which payments are made from appropriations under section 372, all students enrolled for training in such a class shall be counted as 'enrolled in excess of average past enrollment' for purposes of subsection (b).

"(d) For purposes of this section, the number of students enrolled for training in a school, or in a particular year class in a school, for a fiscal year means the number enrolled full time in such school or class for such training, as determined by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations, for the first semester which commences after the beginning of such fiscal year, except that (1) in the case of schools of dental hygiene only students enrolled full time in the first or second year of training offered by such schools shall be counted, (2) in the case of schools of practical nursing only students enrolled full time in the first year of training offered by such schools shall be counted, and (3) in the case of any school which during a fiscal year provides periods of training less than or in excess of the periods of training customarily provided in schools of the same class, regulations shall provide for the determination of enrollments in such school for such fiscal year in such manner as to take reasonable account of the difference in the rate at which students are thus trained.

"(e) A medical, osteopathic, dental, dental hygiene, nursing, or public health school shall be eligible for payments under this part if it is a public or nonprofit institution, within any of the States, exempt from Federal income taxation, and if it has been approved or accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Surgeon General after he has obtained the advice and recommendation of the Council.

#### "APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

"Sec. 373. (a) There are also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, \$5,000,000, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants for construction and equipment to assist in the establishment of new schools and in the improvement and expansion of existing facilities (including teaching hospitals and other related facilities and including equipment thereof) necessary to carry out the purposes of section 371. The Surgeon General, after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council, shall make such grants in the order of the estimated importance or value of the construction and equipment in alleviating the shortage of personnel adequately trained in the medical, osteopathic, nursing (other than practical nursing), dental, dental hygiene, and public-health fields: *Provided, however*, That the Surgeon General shall give priority to areas in which facilities are either nonexistent or inadequate. No such grant—

"(1) shall (except as provided in subsection (b)) be in excess of 50 percent of the cost of the construction and equipment with respect to which it is made;

"(2) shall be made with respect to any construction and equipment for which application is not submitted in accordance with the provisions of this part, prior to July 1, 1954.

Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for the fiscal year in which appropriated and the two succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) (1) If an application meeting the requirements of section 374 (b) is filed, no payments from appropriations under this section shall be made with respect thereto if it is in connection with the construction and equipment of any facility or part of a facility which constitutes a 'hospital' as defined in section 631 (e) of this act unless an application is also made under section 625 of this act for Federal assistance in the cost of such construction and equipment, and such application is approved under such section, or if disapproved under such section, is disapproved solely for one or more of the following reasons: (A) the project has no or insufficient priority, (B) the project is not



included in the State hospital-construction program, or (C) funds are not available from the State's allotments under section 624.

"(2) Federal payments with respect to the construction and equipment of such project—

"(A) shall be made from appropriations pursuant to this section and not from appropriations pursuant to title VI;

"(B) shall be made in amounts, in the manner and subject to the same conditions as is provided for payments under section 625;

"(C) shall not reduce the unobligated portion of the State's allotment under section 624; and

"(D) shall be subject to recapture as provided in section 625 (e).

#### "CONDITIONS FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 374. (a) No payments from appropriations pursuant to section 372 for any fiscal year may be made to any school unless such school has filed an application therefor for such year which contains adequate assurance, as determined by the Surgeon General, that—

"(1) such school provides and will provide reasonable opportunity for the admission of out-of-State students;

"(2) such school will, during the period in which it receives such payments, make every reasonable effort to maintain its income for operating expenses from sources other than the Federal Government at a level equal to that which it was receiving before such payments began (or in the case of a new school, at the highest possible level); and

"(3) such school will submit from time to time such reports as the Surgeon General may reasonably require to carry out the purposes of this part, and will comply with such other conditions as may, subject to the provisions of section 382, be prescribed in regulations.

"(b) Payments from appropriations under section 373 may not be made for the construction and equipment of any new school or of any addition to or improvement in an existing school except upon the filing of an application therefor which the Surgeon General determines contains adequate assurances that the school will, upon completion of the construction and equipment and for a period of ten years thereafter, (1) be operated as a public or nonprofit institution exempt from Federal income taxation, (2) be approved or accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for the purpose by the Surgeon General after he has obtained the advice and recommendation of the Council, and (3) comply with the provisions of subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

#### "PAYMENTS AND WITHHOLDING OR RECAPTURE OF PAYMENTS

"SEC. 375. (a) The Surgeon General, in accordance with regulations, shall determine from time to time the amount to be paid to each school from appropriations under sections 372 and 373 and shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts so determined. Upon receipt of any such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification.

"(b) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a school, finds with respect to payments from appropriations under section 372 or 373 that there is a failure to carry out any assurances given pursuant to section 374 or to comply with regulations under this part, the Surgeon General shall notify such school that further payments will not be made to it from appropriations under such section until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Surgeon General shall make no fur-

ther certification for payments to such school from appropriations under such section.

"(c) If any school with respect to which payments have been made from appropriations under section 373 for the construction and equipment of any building or other facility (other than one to which subsection (b) of such section is applicable) shall, within 10 years after the completion of such construction, fail to carry out any assurances given pursuant to section 374 (b), the United States shall be entitled to recover from the owners of such building or other facility the same percentage of the then value of such building or facility as the amount paid with respect thereto from appropriations under section 373 was of the total cost of such building or facility, such value to be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which such building or facility is located.

#### "APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED FOR SCHOLARSHIPS

"SEC. 376. In order further to increase the number of individuals, adequately trained in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, nursing, public health (including hospital administration), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the seven succeeding fiscal years, such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary for scholarships awarded pursuant to this part. No funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available for any scholarship unless the course of study or training for which it is awarded is begun in or before the first semester which commences after June 30, 1953.

#### "DETERMINATION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR SCHOLARSHIPS IN EACH FIELD

"SEC. 377. Of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 376 for a fiscal year, such amounts as the Surgeon General shall determine, after obtaining the advice and recommendations of the Council and after considering the relative need for scholarships in each of the health fields in which training is provided by schools referred to in any paragraph of section 372 (b) (other than schools referred to in clause (B) or (C) of paragraph (3)), shall be available for scholarships to be awarded to individuals for the pursuit of such training, except that such scholarships shall be awarded only in fields in which there are not enough qualified applicants to fill enrollments in schools which are approved or accredited as provided in section 379 (b) (2).

#### "AWARDING OF SCHOLARSHIPS

"SEC. 378. The selection of individuals to be awarded scholarships from funds appropriated pursuant to section 376 shall be made in accordance with regulations providing for such selection on the basis of ability and the extent to which financial assistance is necessary in order to enable qualified individuals to pursue the courses of training for which the scholarships are awarded, and on the basis of such other factors as are appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part. To the extent practicable and consistent with the purposes of this part, such regulations shall also provide for the selection of individuals in a manner which will tend to result in a wide distribution of the scholarships among the States.

#### "CONDITIONS FOR AWARD OF SCHOLARSHIPS

"SEC. 379. (a) Any students to whom a scholarship has been awarded shall be entitled to continue receiving the amounts thereby provided for only so long as his work continues to be satisfactory, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution which he is attending.

"(b) (1) No scholarship shall be awarded to any individual for any period during

which he is receiving education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

"(2) Any scholarship awarded under this part to any individual shall be conditioned upon acceptance by a school of his choice which provides the training for which the scholarship is awarded and which is approved or accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for this purpose by the Surgeon General after he has obtained the advice and recommendation of the Council.

#### "SCOPE OF SCHOLARSHIPS

"SEC. 380. Scholarships awarded under this part shall include the cost of tuition customarily charged by the school, educational fees, books, and equipment, and such amount for maintenance as the Surgeon General, after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council, determines for each school. Such scholarship shall be for a period of time not in excess of that customarily required for completion of the standard course offered by the school.

#### "REGULATIONS

"SEC. 381. All regulations under this part with respect to payments to schools of medicine, schools of osteopathy, schools of dentistry, schools of dental hygiene, schools of nursing, and schools of public health, and with respect to scholarships, shall be made by the Surgeon General after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council.

#### "GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 382. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this part, nothing contained in this part shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the curriculum or administration of any school, or the admission of applicants thereto.

"(b) Nothing in this part shall be construed to authorize the Surgeon General or any State agency to exercise any influence upon the choice by an applicant for, or a recipient of, a scholarship under this part of a course of training or study or of the educational institution at which such course is to be pursued."

#### NATIONAL COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONS

SEC. 3. Section 217 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) The National Council on Education for Health Professions shall consist of the Surgeon General, and the Commissioner of Education or his representative, who shall be nonvoting ex officio members, and 10 members (not otherwise in the full-time employment of the Federal Government) appointed without regard to the civil-service laws by the President. The 10 appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of health sciences, education, or public affairs, and 3 of the 10 shall be persons active in the fields of professional health education. The terms of such appointed members shall expire June 30, 1954. The Council shall elect one of its members to act as chairman.

"(2) The Surgeon General shall, with the approval of the Administrator, appoint a special advisory and technical committee for each of the fields of medical, dental, nursing, public health, and osteopathic education, each such committee to consist of members selected from leading authorities in the field of education concerned, and the membership of the committee on nursing education to include leading authorities in the field of hospital administration. The Surgeon General may also appoint such additional advisory and technical committees as may be useful in carrying out his and the Council's functions under part H of title III of this act.

"(3) Appointed members of the Council, and members of technical and advisory committees who are not officers or employees of the United States, while serving on the business of the Surgeon General or Council, shall receive compensation at rates fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and shall be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their homes.

"(4) The Council shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General with reference to matters of general policy and administration arising in connection with the carrying out of his duties under part H of title III. The Surgeon General shall include in his annual report to the Administrator under section 511, and in his special report to the Congress under section 372 (f), a record of consultations with the Council, recommendations of the Council, and comments thereon.

"(5) Not later than January 1, 1952, the Council shall transmit to the Congress its recommendations concerning the extent and nature of support of education of professional and other health personnel (including practical nurses) which should be made available by the Federal Government in order to provide adequate health personnel to meet the health needs of the people. For such purpose, the Council shall conduct such surveys and studies as it deems appropriate, including studies of the financial condition of schools providing education in the health profession, and the relationship of their financial condition to their capacity to maintain and expand student enrollment, studies of the educational costs of such schools and of feasible means of calculating such costs on a uniform or comparable basis, and studies of the extent to which equal opportunity to gain an education in the health professions is afforded all properly qualified students. To the extent practicable in performing its functions under this paragraph, the Council may utilize the services and facilities of the Service, and may procure such information and services from other Federal agencies as are available from them; and, to the extent necessary to perform such functions, it may employ personnel without regard to the civil-service or classification laws and may also contract with other agencies, organizations, and individuals, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, for such services and supplies as it finds necessary."

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN PRACTICAL NURSING

SEC. 4. The Vocational Education Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 775) is amended by inserting "Title I—Vocational education in agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and distributive occupations" immediately above the heading of section 1 of such act, by changing the words "this act" wherever they appear in such act to read "this title", and by adding immediately after section 9 the following new title:

#### "TITLE II—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN PRACTICAL NURSING

##### "DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 201. When used in this title—

"(a) the term 'practical nurse' means a person who is trained to care for subacute, convalescent, and chronic patients under the direction of a licensed physician or under the supervision of a registered professional nurse, or to assist a registered professional nurse in the care of acute illness;

"(b) the term 'State' includes the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia;

"(c) the term 'Administrator' means the Federal Security Administrator;

"(d) the term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education of the Federal Security Agency; and

"(e) the term 'State board' means the State board for vocational education.

##### "STATE PLANS

"SEC. 202. (a) In order for a State to secure the benefits of this title, the State board shall submit, and have approved by the Commissioner, a State plan for practical nurse training. To be approved under this title, a State plan for practical nurse training must provide (1) that such training shall be given under public supervision or control; (2) that the purpose of such training shall be to fit individuals for useful employment as practical nurses; (3) that such training shall be of less than college grade and shall be designed to meet the needs of persons over 16 years of age who are preparing to enter upon or who have entered upon the vocation of practical nursing; (4) that such training shall include such courses of practical training and instruction and such supervised experience as are necessary to meet the minimum requirements of State licensing laws for practical nurses, or, where such laws have not been enacted, that the State board shall establish adequate standards for such training and instruction; (5) that teachers of practical nurse courses in any State shall have at least the minimum qualifications for teachers of such subjects determined upon for such State by the State board, with the approval of the Commissioner; (6) for the availability of professional education courses necessary for the certification of teachers, supervisors, and directors of practical nurse training: *Provided*, That if such training is given under the auspices of the State board, it shall be given, except in the case of teachers of related subjects, only to persons who have had adequate experience in nursing; (7) duties and qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors and directors, and plans for the supervision and direction of practical nurse training; (8) for an advisory council composed of not more than 10 nor less than 6 persons, including not less than two registered nurses, a physician, an educator, a hospital administrator, and such other persons the State may desire, all of whom shall be appointed for overlapping terms of not to exceed 3 years; (9) that the State treasurer (or similar officer) shall be custodian of funds paid to the State under this title and shall pay such funds only on requisition of the State board to such schools as are approved by the board and are entitled to receive payments under the plan; (10) evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner that full compliance with the requirements of this title is authorized under the State laws; (11) that the State board shall make an annual report to the Commissioner on or before September 1 of each year, on such forms and in such manner as the Commissioner may prescribe, on the work done in the State during the preceding fiscal year and the receipts and expenditures of money under the State plan approved under this title; and (12) that the State board has all the authority necessary to carry out the State plan and to cooperate with the Commissioner in the administration of this title.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) and which he finds is otherwise in conformity with the provisions and purposes of this title.

##### "AUTHORIZATIONS FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 203. (a) For the purpose of assuring more adequate funds for assisting the several States in the development of practical nurse training, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, \$2,500,000 for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) There is also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, and for each of the four succeeding

fiscal years such amount as may be necessary for the administration of this title.

"(c) The funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be used for assisting the several States in meeting the direct costs of maintaining an adequate program of administration, supervision, and teacher training; for salaries and necessary travel expenses of teachers, teacher trainers, supervisors, and directors of practical nurse training and for necessary travel expenses of students taking practical training in a hospital outside the community in which the school is located; for securing necessary educational information and data as a basis for the proper development of programs of practical nurse training; for purchase, rental, or other acquisition and the repair and maintenance of equipment for vocational instruction; for purchase of supplies for vocational instruction; for the costs of operation of necessary buildings; to provide initially for alteration of public buildings to facilitate such training (not to exceed \$2,500 per training unit); for promotion of the program and recruitment of students and teachers; and for payments to public or nonprofit private hospitals exempt from income tax under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code to meet costs incurred by them in affording opportunity to practical nurse trainees for supervised experience in such hospitals: *Provided*, That all expenditures for the purposes set forth in this section shall be made in accordance with the State plan approved under this title.

##### "PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 204. (a) Of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to section 203 (a), 50 percent shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States having State plans approved prior to the beginning of such year, in the proportion which the population of each such State bears to the population of all the States having State plans so approved. The remaining 50 percent of such amount shall be allotted by the Commissioner among such of the States having approved State plans as he determines, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Administrator, can make the most efficient use of such funds for the purposes of this title.

"(b) From time to time the Commissioner shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State such amounts, within the allotment to such State, as shall be necessary to carry out the approved State plan. Upon receipt of any such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with said certification.

"(c) Funds appropriated pursuant to this title shall not be paid to any State until a State supervisor of practical nurse training, who is a qualified nurse and who meets the minimum requirements established in the State plan, has been employed.

##### "REGULATIONS

"SEC. 205. The Commissioner, with the approval of the Administrator, shall make and publish such regulations, not inconsistent with this title, as may be necessary to the efficient administration of its provisions.

##### "ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 206. The Commissioner shall perform his functions under this title under the supervision and direction of the Administrator. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner to make, or cause to have made, studies, investigations, and reports for use in aiding the States in training practical nurses and teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors of practical nurse training.

##### "ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 207. The Commissioner shall make an annual report to the Administrator con-



cerning the administration of this title, including reports to show the distribution of Federal funds, the activities of the States in the training program, the numbers of persons trained thereunder, and recommendations for such revisions of this title as he deems necessary. The Administrator shall include in his annual report to the Congress such portions of the Commissioner's report as the Administrator deems necessary.

#### "ADVISORY COMMITTEES"

"SEC. 208. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Administrator, appoint such advisory committees on practical nurse training as he deems necessary to the proper administration of this title. The members of such committees who are not officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation, except that while attending conferences or meetings of the committees or while otherwise serving at the request of the Commissioner they shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding \$50 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

#### "WITHHOLDING OR RECAPTURE OF PAYMENTS"

"SEC. 209. (a) Whenever any portion of the funds paid to any State under this title has not been expended in accordance with its provisions, a sum equal to such portion shall be deducted by the Commissioner from subsequent payments hereunder to such State and the State shall be held accountable for the full amount so paid plus an amount equal to that withheld.

"(b) The Commissioner may withhold the allotment or payment of any moneys to any State under this title whenever he determines that such moneys are not being expended in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(c) If any portion of the moneys paid to any State under this title shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost, it shall be replaced by such State, and until so replaced no subsequent payments shall be made to such State under this title. No funds paid to a State under this title shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair (other than alterations) of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of lands, or payment (except as provided in section 203 (c)) to any privately owned or conducted school, college, or other institution."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I can state very briefly the purpose of the bill. It is generally recognized that in this country we are short of facilities for the training of doctors, dentists, nurses, public-health administrators, sanitary engineers, and certain other technical workers in the health field. The committee in its report has set out at length the need for Federal legislation on this subject. It is generally known that medical education is very expensive. It is estimated that the cost for a medical student is something like \$2,200 a year, as compared with \$500 a year for the ordinary student.

All over the country there is a great drain upon the sources for the support of medical education. I have before me, which I am authorized to use in the discussion of this subject, a very clear-cut and full statement on the subject by the sponsors of the National Fund For Medical Education, an organization with offices at 535 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Let me read the names of some of those who are associated with that enterprise. I will start with the

names of the trustees: Herbert Hoover, S. Sloan Colt, Samuel D. Leidesdorf, and William E. Cotter, who is secretary. Some of the others are Winthrop W. Aldrich, Donald C. Balfour, William B. Bell, and so forth.

That group has this to say, as a preliminary to its effort to establish a national medical education fund to be used in connection with public appropriations for medical education:

The quality of medical care enjoyed by the people of the United States today is unsurpassed by that in any other country.

At this very moment, however, the institutions that produce our skilled physicians, dentists, public-health officers and other workers in the health field are faced with critical financial problems.

These problems are so critical as to threaten seriously their ability to provide the Nation with either the quality or the quantity of trained personnel essential to maintain and improve the health of our people.

Expansion of training facilities and progressive improvement in the standards of education in all health fields are needed if the Nation is even to approach the maximum benefits made possible by modern medical science.

So acute is the financial condition of all our colleges of medicine and related professional schools, that few can continue even their present programs for long without prompt and large-scale financial aid.

Some of these institutions are in immediate danger of closing down for lack of funds.

It is unthinkable that the American public, once they realize the serious financial plight of these important professional schools, will fail to give them the generous financial support they merit in the enlightened self-interest of the Nation.

It is proposed, therefore, to establish a National Fund for Medical Education.

The purpose of the fund is to raise a substantial sum of money annually from the American people in support of medical and health education.

The situation, and the plans to help remedy it through private philanthropy, are outlined briefly on the following pages.

The best solution appears to be to balance Government appropriations with adequate support from private philanthropy. In this way the medical schools would have assured income from two independent sources and maintain their academic and administrative freedom so vital in a democratic society. Government and private philanthropy would be cooperating, as they are now in medical research and in other areas, toward a common goal in making democracy work.

If the Federal Government should appropriate sums in aid of medical education similar to those asked of the Eightieth Congress, some \$40,000,000 would be available during the first year of the new law.

This would leave approximately \$22,000,000 to be raised from private sources in annual aid of all medical education—

And so forth.

Mr. President, that is almost exactly the amount provided in this bill for direct assistance to medical schools, to enable them to continue to provide medical education.

Let me say this is a 5-year program only, for it is contemplated that before the Federal Government shall launch permanently upon a program of this character, we shall have the results of a study of a National Council on Medical Education, which is provided for in this

measure. That Council is obligated by the bill to report to the Government within 3 years. So, when we launch upon the permanent program, we shall have before us the results of the study which will be made by the National Council on Medical Education.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator from Florida is going to discuss it, but I would appreciate it if he will tell us the cost of each of the various titles, for in reading the bill it is rather difficult to ascertain the cost.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. The bill itself does not provide express authorization, but it lays down categories of aid. Of course, the amount of expense to be met by the Government would depend upon the conditions.

However, I have here, and I should like to present for the RECORD at this time, estimates—which have been carefully formulated—as to what the several items of cost will be. These estimates, if I may say so, are based on data which have been gathered from a long series of conferences with the outstanding representatives of medical education in the United States. I shall incorporate in the RECORD a list of the persons whom the committee consulted on this matter, who came to Washington and discussed it with us, and I shall also include in the RECORD a statement of the positions they hold.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to ask the Senator from Florida upon what basis the \$40,000,000 will be allotted. Will it be allotted on the basis of the present registration in the various medical schools and colleges throughout the United States?

Mr. PEPPER. The allocation is to be made upon the basis of the average enrollment. Normally, it will be on the basis of the average enrollment for the years 1947-48-49; but if a particular school did not have enrollments for those 3 years, then the basis will be its average enrollment for a shorter period of time. That will be called the average past enrollment, and it will be the basis upon which the school—meaning every public or nonprofit institution in the country—will receive funds. It will receive \$500 a year for each student in its average past enrollment. For each additional student the institution may be able to take on, it will receive an additional amount of \$500 a year. Of course the purpose is to enable the institutions to take on, if possible, more students than they have accommodated in the past.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Florida. I am heartily in favor of the bill, and I have already talked to him considerably about it.

The grant of the \$500 aid per student, plus \$500 for each new student, would be in the nature of Federal aid to education, but under State supervision. Is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. It will be under State supervision where there are State institutions. In the case of private institutions not operated for profit, it will be under the management of those institutions.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, it is provided that the Federal Government shall have nothing to do with the curriculum or with control of the institution itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Florida for presenting such an able bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much. He has manifested great interest in the subject for a long time.

Mr. President, let me give the names of the persons whom the committee consulted on this subject.

Dr. Basil G. Bibbey, professor of dentistry, University of Rochester, and for Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, representing the American Council on Education.

Dr. Russell W. Bunting, dean of the University of Michigan Dental School.

Let me interpolate that this bill provides for aid in the form of grants and scholarships for education in the medical, dental, dental hygiene, public health, nursing, and sanitary engineering professions.

In the field of public health, the recipients will be public-health administrators and public-health engineering personnel.

In nursing, there are two categories: The professional nurse who is being trained in a professional nursing school; and then the practical nurse, who comes in under the George Varden Vocational Training Act, in the public schools. Two million five hundred thousand dollars a year will be allowed for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, what will the approximate total cost be?

Mr. PEPPER. It will be a little over \$56,000,000 a year, on the average, for the 5-year period. It will go from forty-odd-million dollars for the first year, up to sixty-odd-million dollars, so that for the 5-year period the average will be approximately \$50,000,000 a year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That will be for the purpose of scholarships and to assist in educating our young people, and also to stimulate—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should have stated at the beginning that there will be three categories of assistance. The first is Federal aid to medical, osteopathic, dental, dental hygiene, nursing, and public-health schools, in the training of personnel. That aid will be extended on the basis I have already stated, namely, instead of providing \$500 for each student in those schools, \$500 will be provided for each of the students in the average past enrollment of the medical schools; \$400 a year in the case of the dental schools; and the rates go down to \$150 a year in the case of the nursing schools. That allotment will be made on the basis of the average past enrollment, and a similar amount will be allowed in the case of new or additional enrollments.

So, Mr. President, the first part of the program under this bill will be for the teaching of additional students and to continue with the education of students who have been taught in the past. Aid will be extended on the basis of the average enrollment.

Second, the bill will authorize the enlargement of existing facilities and the provision of new facilities, in the categories mentioned, for training more personnel. Five million dollars a year will be allowed for that purpose. Of course, that means that if it is possible for such institutions to enlarge their classrooms or to increase their teaching facilities, this bill will encourage them to do so. In places where existing facilities are inadequate or where there are no facilities at all at the present time, the bill will permit of the building of new facilities or the enlarging of existing ones. But for that entire job, only \$5,000,000 a year is provided.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the aid for construction go to private institutions as well as public ones?

Mr. PEPPER. In that respect, the bill is exactly like the hospital bill; the aid will go to private institutions as well as public institutions, if the private institutions are not operated for profit, and if they qualify under the conditions provided in the bill.

The third part of the program is made up of provision for a series of scholarships. The Surgeon General will be permitted to award scholarships to students to permit them to take training in the institutions I have described.

However, on the suggestion of the able Senator from Ohio in the committee, provision is made that scholarships cannot be given except in respect to schools which do not have as many students as their capacity permits them to handle. In other words, at the present time and for the next few years it is contemplated that the only schools with respect to which scholarships will be granted under the bill will be schools of nursing and schools of public health. It is understood that all the other schools already have more applicants than they can possibly train, anyway.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Who prescribes what the standards of the schools shall be? In other words, who selects the schools?

Mr. PEPPER. The language of the bill makes that very clear. The schools have to be approved by the associations. It reads:

A medical, osteopathic, dental, dental hygiene, nursing, or public health school shall be eligible for payments under this part if it is a public or nonprofit institution, within any of the States, exempt from Federal income taxation, and if it has been approved or accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Surgeon General after he has obtained the advice and recommendation of the Council.

It means for all practical purposes the usual associations that accredit institutions in this country.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] rose first. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I want only to emphasize the fact that to a certain extent this is a temporary program, and that we have set up, as appears on page 51, a National Council of Education for Health Professions, to study this whole subject. We were not satisfied this was the final way, but we faced an emergency situation, and so we created this Council. We provide that not later than January 1, 1952, after making a complete study of the whole matter, it "shall transmit to the Congress its recommendations concerning the extent and nature of support of education of professional and other health personnel." We want a complete study made, and the Council has slightly more than 2 years in which to make it. We can then revise the system if we want to. In the meantime, it appeared that the medical and other schools might well go broke, that some of them might have to shut down, and we would have fewer doctors instead of more doctors. We thought of it as an emergency proposition. The construction money, for instance, is \$5,000,000 a year. It is not really a program of construction; it is only to enable schools to make such adjustments as may enable them to add needed personnel without much expense. If we started out to build medical schools, it would cost a good deal more than all the construction money the bill provides even to build one or two, or to build two, anyway.

I wanted to emphasize the fact that this is an emergency program to meet a particular situation, and that we are creating the Council for the purpose of making a complete study of the whole matter. A good many doctors and educators were dubious about the wisdom of having the Federal Government involved in the project, yet they could see no other remedy at the present time.

It costs \$2,500 a year to educate a medical student. Six hundred dollars is about the limit of the tuition which can be charged. The other \$1,900 must be made up by the schools. Their endowment funds bring in a little less interest, and their costs today are twice what they were before the war, as are all other costs; so there is a very serious emergency situation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Florida yielded to me. I shall stop talking.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I should like the Senator to continue, but I should like to interpolate in connection with what he is so well saying, that we have provided in the bill that, so far as possible, the schools that are the beneficiaries of these funds shall continue outside sources of revenue which they have had in the past, as nearly as possible at the former level. Just as in our school legislation and other legislation we have passed, this school aid is not a substitute which can be used to avoid other assistance. We are simply trying to supplement. Am I not correct?



Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. We are simply trying to supplement. We do not want the States that are running medical schools to let down on their State appropriations. We want to give more, so they may expand their facilities and educate more doctors than they are now educating.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator mentioned the fact that the bill includes schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and nursing. I wonder why chiropractic schools were left out of the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I may say to the Senator the matter of including chiropractic schools was considered in the committee, but, after long deliberation, the committee felt it did not have information at the present time to justify inclusion of such schools. At least that was the vote taken in committee, and it is the present judgment of the committee, although the Senator from Florida can assure the Senator from Washington that he and the committee appreciate the very important character of chiropractic institutions, and are quite aware of the great contributions they are making to the public interest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I feel so keenly about this that, inasmuch as osteopathy is included in the bill, I shall have to submit an amendment to include schools of chiropractic.

Mr. TAFT. So long as the Senator does not ask for a roll call, I think I have no objection to his offering an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I may inquire, has this bill passed the House, or did it originate in the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. The bill originates in the Senate. However, the members of the opposite committee in the House have been very much interested, and a companion bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives. We are assured this bill will receive most sympathetic consideration when it reaches the House. Will the Senator withhold offering his amendment until we can continue a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I shall withhold it. I want to add that, of course, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the purposes of the pending bill. It so happens I had luncheon today with the president of my university, a distinguished medical man, Dr. Raymond B. Allen, who is now on leave to the Secretary of Defense, and engaged in the work of coordinating medical activities of all the services. He was discussing this very bill, and he said, in view of his attendance upon numerous conferences of hospital associations and medical associations, in his opinion we are meeting the real problem through the pending bill. It is the problem of the shortage of doctors, even more so than a shortage of hospital beds and of bricks and mortar, which is seriously affecting our Nation's health, and particularly in view of the hiatus we had of about 6 years when very few medical men were trained. I am not against the bill, but it seems to me on the matter of chiropractic schools, inasmuch as one branch or so-called offshoot of the med-

ical profession, namely, osteopathy, is included, the other principal offshoot ought to be included.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to permit me to ask the Senator from Washington a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator advised as to whether any schools of chiropractic meet the other requirements of the bill as to nonprofit operation? Are they not schools operating for profit?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. I know some are, and some are not. I know the same thing is true with respect to some of the schools of osteopathy; some operate for profit, some do not.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I commend the Senator from Florida for the very devoted work he has done in connection with the bill, and for the very great contribution he has made in bringing it to the floor of the Senate. There is a very definite emergency, even among medical schools which in the past have been regarded as relatively rich. They once had the necessary funds with which to provide the courses young men wished to take in order to prepare for the medical profession. Now, the schools simply do not have the necessary funds. It is true even of schools that once were regarded as rich, and it is true of practically every medical school in the country today, that the schools cannot expand their forces to train more young men and to meet the very acute shortage of doctors, unless they have Federal aid, and unless the

funds proposed in the bill are provided. The shortage, instead of becoming less acute each year, will become increasingly more acute, unless we pass the pending bill. The shortage of doctors, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians of all kinds will increase.

I merely desire to associate myself with the Senator from Florida in all he has said in behalf of the bill. I take pride in the fact that I was a member of the committee which previously reported the bill to the Senate. I join with the Senator from Florida in urging its passage.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the generous words of the very able Senator from Alabama. However, I desire to emphasize that this bill has the unanimous support of the committee. The name of every member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, including of course the name of the able Senator from Alabama, who has just spoken, appears upon the bill as one of its active authors and sponsors. The distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] has also long been interested in this subject, and his name appears on the bill as one of its introducers and sponsors.

Mr. President, I have here a table which shows the schedules and the type of assistance to be given by the Government under this bill, and the amounts which it is estimated the Government will be required to expend in carrying out and implementing the bill. I ask that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in the discussion.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Payments to schools for instruction under proposed amendments of the Public Health Service Act*

(Committee Print No. 2, S. 1453, July 29, 1949)

Type of school	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54
Medicine.....	\$12,825,000	\$14,086,000	\$15,607,000	\$17,516,000	\$19,090,500
Dentistry.....	4,735,600	5,171,200	5,777,200	6,486,800	7,036,000
Dental hygiene.....	146,700	163,500	169,500	175,200	177,900
Nursing:					
Diploma.....	10,438,750	11,677,950	13,134,800	15,049,450	16,285,250
Degrees.....	1,255,600	1,359,600	1,513,800	1,718,600	1,850,600
Advanced degree.....	1,240,000	1,530,000	1,740,000	1,950,000	2,040,000
Practical.....	100,200	110,250	120,300	130,500	139,500
Public health.....	876,000	994,000	1,108,000	1,224,000	1,224,000
Sanitary engineering.....	35,750	40,750	45,250	50,250	50,250
Osteopathy.....	1,178,500	1,374,500	1,479,500	1,605,000	1,669,000
Total.....	32,832,100	36,487,750	40,695,350	45,905,800	49,554,000

5-year total, \$205,475,000; average per year, \$41,095,000.

NOTES.—(1) In the above calculations, it has been assumed that the 30-percent limit on "incentive expansion" will be reached in 4 years. (2) In addition to the above, \$5,000,000 is to be expended annually for assistance to schools in expansion of facilities, and \$5,000,000 annually for practical nurse training under amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1946.

OVER-ALL COSTS

	Average per year	Total 5 years
Scholarships.....	\$7,016,175	\$35,129,400
Costs of instruction.....	41,095,000	205,475,000
Vocational education (practical nursing).....	2,500,000	25,000,000
Construction.....	5,000,000	25,000,000
Total.....	55,611,175	311,604,400

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also ask that there be included at this point in the body of the RECORD the names of the medical authorities and institutions with which they are associated, who advised the committee in the formulation of the bill.

There being no objection, the list of names was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Open hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for a week (June 6-10, 1949), giving those who wished

to testify an opportunity to present their opinions on the provisions of title I of S. 1679 and title VI of S. 1581, which would establish programs of financial aid to education in the health professions. In the impressive body of testimony, given by representatives of educational institutions, professional organizations, and administrators in the fields of medicine, dentistry, public health, and nursing, substantial agreement was expressed on the urgent needs for Federal aid to education and on the objectives of the programs outlined in both bills. It appeared from the testimony, moreover, that with relatively little adjustment of details, the provisions of S. 1679 would be acceptable to the educators in the professions concerned. All witnesses were therefore asked if they could hold themselves available during the following week to discuss with the staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the changes which they considered necessary to insure endorsement of the bill by the organizations which they represented. All agreed.

Accordingly, during four full days, a series of working sessions with representatives of educational organizations in the respective professions discussed the specific adjustments which would assist the Senate committee in reconciling any differences of opinion on legislative and administrative details of the bill. Dr. Lowell J. Reed, vice president, Johns Hopkins University, served as chairman of the sessions. All meetings were attended by Dr. Carlyle F. Jacobsen, executive dean of the division of health sciences and services of the State University of Iowa, representing the National Association of State Universities; by Mr. William G. Reidy and Mr. Melvin W. Snead of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and by Dr. W. Palmer Dearing, Deputy Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, and selected members of his staff.

A full day (June 14) was spent on discussion of provisions for dental education, with the following participants:

Dr. Basil G. Bibbey, professor of dentistry, University of Rochester, and for Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president of Tufts College, representing the American Council on Education.

Dr. Russell W. Bunting, dean, University of Michigan Dental School.

Dr. John P. Burke, dean, Georgetown University Dental School.

Dr. J. Ben Robinson, dean, University of Maryland Dental School, and Informal Committee of Deans of Dental Schools.

Two full days (June 15 and 16) were devoted to medical education, with the following participants:

Dr. Donald Anderson, secretary, Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. George Berry, associate dean, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, and executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges, speaks for Chancellors Weston, of Brown; Conant, of Harvard; Hutchins, of Chicago, Association of American Universities; Gustavson, of Nebraska, in endorsing statement.

Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, dean, Cornell Medical School, and chairman, executive council, Association of American Medical Colleges (second day only).

Dr. Victor Johnson, director, Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, and Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. Joseph S. Lawrence, director, Washington office, American Medical Association.

Mr. A. H. Monk, director, Training Facilities Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, Veterans' Administration (second day only).

Dr. William Perkins, dean, Jefferson College of Philadelphia Medical School.

Father William Rooney, professor, Catholic University.

Dr. Dean F. Smiley, secretary, Association American Medical Colleges.

Mr. E. K. Taylor, business manager, College of Medicine, Cornell University (second day only).

Dr. Harvey Stone, Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, American Medical Association.

Dr. Herman G. Welskotten, dean, Syracuse University College of Medicine, and chairman, Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, American Medical Association.

Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, Council on Government Relations, American Hospital Association.

Discussion of public-health education was completed in one-half day (morning of June 17) with the following participants:

Dr. Gaylord Anderson, director, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, and secretary, Association American Schools of Public Health.

Mr. George Brakeley, public relations consultant to Harvard University.

Dr. Thorndyke Saville, dean of engineering, New York University, and vice president, American Society for Engineering Education.

Dr. James S. Simmons, dean, school of public health, Harvard University, and president, Association American Schools of Public Health.

One-half day (afternoon of June 17) was given to nursing education with the following participants:

Miss Edith Beattie, executive secretary, Graduate Nurses' Association, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. George Bugbee, executive director, American Hospital Association.

Miss Olwen Davies, associate director, National Organization for Public Health Nurses, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Margaret Foley, executive secretary, Association of Catholic Schools of Nursing.

Miss Deborah Jensen, professor of nursing education, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Irene Murchison, director, school of nursing at Loretta Heights College, Loretta, Colo., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Sister Olivia, dean, School of Nursing, Catholic University, Washington, D. C., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Miss Blanche Pfefferkorn, director of department of studies, the National League of Nursing Education, New York City, and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. Donald Smith, attorney, American Nurses' Association.

Mrs. Eugenia Spaulding, director, division of nursing, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., and legislative committee, American Nurses' Association.

Mr. Albert V. Whitehall, secretary, council on government relations, American Hospital Association.

Sister Xavier, director, Mercy Hospital School of Nursing, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will recall that I brought to his attention, as well as to that of the other members of the committee, a communication which I had received from Dr. Gaylord Anderson of the University of Minnesota.

There was a question as to the amendment of a certain section of Senate bill

1453, on page 39, where the language reads:

To each school of public health which provides training leading to a graduate degree in fields relating to public health, which may include training leading to a graduate degree in hospital administration, \$1,000 for each student enrolled for such training and, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), an additional \$1,000 for each student so enrolled in excess of its average past enrollment.

Here is the query which has been presented by responsible medical men, as to whether, under the appropriations provided for in the bill, to be used in schools of public health, a university, a school, or a college would be authorized to include students who are enrolled in a school of public health, but are taking courses in some other department in the university. For example, let me cite this situation: There may be an enrollee in the school of public health, but the majority of the courses he takes are in other departments such as a department of bacteriology, or a department of chemistry. Those courses would make up his course of study, but the student would not be in the physical plant of a particular school.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, the criterion is the curriculum. If the courses are in the curriculum leading to a graduate degree in a particular field, that is the criterion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wanted to have that brought out, because a large number of State universities do not have all the students in their particular school. They will take courses in other departments, which lead to a degree from a particular school, such as a school of nursing or a school of public health.

Mr. PEPPER. It is what they take; and not the location of the school, that is the criterion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, at a later moment I should like to have included in the Record some letters, so that the question may be more clearly understood.

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest that the letters be incorporated in the body of the Record immediately following my remarks.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I take it from a hurried reading of the bill that schools which do not give a complete degree are included, such, for instance, as a premedical school. Our State university has a 2-year course which is called a premedical course. I take it that students taking that course in our university would be eligible under this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid I must advise the able Senator to the contrary. It applies only to those who are in medical schools as such, and not taking premedical education. It is intended to take hold at that place in the career of a student where he is enrolled and is technically known and recognized as a medical student.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator will notice that the language is, "leading to a



medical degree." I believe that is about the wording of it.

Mr. PEPPER. I am assuming that that is not a recognized part of the curriculum leading to the granting of a medical degree. I realize that schools may require a certain amount of education preliminary to entering upon technical training. I happened to go to Harvard Law School, and I had to be a college graduate in order to enter that school. But I did not go into the law school until I had enrolled in that subject.

Mr. GURNEY. There are many persons in my State who are making vigorous efforts to establish a complete medical school. The legislature, so far, has not seen fit to appropriate money actually to establish a medical school in South Dakota. Supposing the university should make a request to establish a medical school under the terms of this bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I would say to the able Senator that my State is similarly situated. We do not have a medical school. This bill provides \$5,000,000 a year, which, of course, will have to be allocated among the applicants for the enlargement of existing facilities and the establishment of new facilities. I realize that \$5,000,000 a year will not go very far. Some of us would have preferred to provide a larger sum, but some felt it would have to be a small amount, because we had not yet received the recommendations of the National Council on Education. But the Senator will have reason to urge that this is an area within the terms of the Humphrey amendment, which provides that aid shall be given first to those areas which are inadequately provided with facilities or in which there are no facilities in existence. So his State can urge upon the Surgeon General that it comes within that preferred category. He can have the assurance that, if there is a hospital as a part of the medical school, he can get his State hospital board to give priority or first preference to that hospital, and it can get 57 cents out of every dollar of construction cost that may be required, if the House of Representatives passes the new hospital bill which the Senate has already passed. So the Senator can tell his State that it can get that much Federal aid in the building of a necessary adjunct. Then the Senator can also look forward, I hope, to the housing bill, which I trust will be passed at this session, which will allow borrowing in connection with the cost of building dormitories and faculty homes at 2½ percent interest over a period of 40 years. In the last analysis, the Senator's State can look forward to \$1,000 a student, under this bill, for students who are subsequently enrolled in the medical school, once it is established. So this bill is exceedingly meaningful to an area such as the State of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. GURNEY. The payments are all based on whether Congress appropriates annually the needed funds.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. This is only an authorization.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Florida says his State does not have a medical school, as such, and I know that

my State does not have one. Is there anything in the bill which makes it mandatory that funds be allocated to Florida or to South Dakota?

Mr. PEPPER. No, it is not mandatory, but it is provided in the bill.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it provided that a fair distribution shall be made in different parts of the country? Is there anything like that in the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. On page 43, line 6, under section 373, it is provided:

*Provided, however, That the Surgeon General shall give priority to areas in which facilities are either nonexistent or inadequate.*

That lays down the principle which would give the State of South Dakota the right to have assistance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says that lays down the principle which would give the State of South Dakota the right.

Mr. PEPPER. I am in error in respect to the State. I thought he was speaking about the State being the applicant. It would also apply to any other applicant.

Mr. GURNEY. I was merely using that as an example.

Mr. LUCAS. It would apply to any applicant in a community where facilities were nonexistent or inadequate.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Where they do not have a hospital, or do not have the facilities to which the Senator has referred. I am wondering how broad the word "areas" is, because we keep talking about States all the time.

Mr. PEPPER. The language of the bill is with respect to areas.

Mr. LUCAS. What is an area?

Mr. PEPPER. That will have to be decided by the Surgeon General.

Mr. LUCAS. Should it not be States, instead of areas?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I think we should understand very clearly that it would be most uneconomical and most inadvisable to set up a major medical school in every State in the Union. That would mean more medical schools than we could afford to support. It would be well beyond the capacity of some States to support a medical school. The plan which Dr. Parran had for the expansion in the number of medical schools in order to get more doctors, I think, provided for about eight medical schools in the whole country, in addition to those which now exist, so far as new schools were concerned.

This particular grant of \$5,000,000 a year was not really intended for new schools. The buildings for a new school would probably cost \$5,000,000, or possibly \$10,000,000, if the desire is to set them up on a first-class-medical-school basis. This is really intended for use awaiting the report of the Commission on the whole problem of whether we should have new schools or expand old schools. I think this is really intended to make it

possible to give the existing schools enough money so that by adding a building or two they could add to the number of students they could handle. I do not think it should be understood or claimed that we are going to provide a medical school for every State in the Union. I think it would be very unwise to do that. There is a proposal for a regional school in Denver to cover four or five States, perhaps. There is the same situation in various other places.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not want the RECORD to remain quite as the Senator from Ohio would have it appear from his statement. Of course, with only \$5,000,000 available in a single year, it would not be expected that those making the allocations would take the whole \$5,000,000 and give it to an applicant in one particular area and deny any of it to any other applicant. There has to be a matching, 50-50, by the applicant. The Federal contribution cannot exceed 50 percent of the total cost of construction. It does not mean at all that an applicant in South Dakota might not get \$250,000, or even half a million. It is all left to the judgment of the Surgeon General, and he will have to survey the picture to determine where the need is.

I do not want the language, which is very clear, to be understood, by interpretation, to exclude from the Surgeon General the power to give assistance in the beginning to medical schools where he might feel that an effort was being adequately made by local people, where the need was great.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, when we come to scholarship, there is a provision for distributing the money among the States. The scholarship provision states:

To the extent practicable and consistent with the purposes of this part, such regulations shall also provide for the selection of individuals in a manner which will tend to result in a wide distribution of the scholarships among the States.

That is somewhat general, but I do not think it could be construed in any other way than to give a State a proportionate share.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. There is no geographical requirement of distribution on an equality basis. But we did want to emphasize that the Surgeon General should look over the picture and try primarily to help first those areas where the need was most pressing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from Florida. Section 373 disagrees with what the Senator from Ohio said with respect to the construction of schools. It is very plain. It provides:

There are also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, \$5,000,000, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants for construction and equipment to assist in the establishment of new schools.

If the Surgeon General makes a determination, under that language, that a new school should be built in South Dakota, I presume it would go there.

Mr. PEPPER. He has authority to do it, undoubtedly.

Mr. LUCAS. I think perhaps what I said with respect to the word "areas" being changed to "States" was erroneous, because I agree with the Senator from Ohio that perhaps there should not be a medical school in each State. Perhaps it should be in the region, rather than in the State.

Mr. PEPPER. I will call attention to the language in line 24, page 42:

The Surgeon General, after obtaining the advice and recommendation of the Council, shall make such grants in the order of the estimated importance or value of the construction and equipment in alleviating the shortage of personnel adequately trained in the medical, osteopathic, nursing (other than practical nursing), dental, dental hygiene, and public-health fields.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to get clear the interpretation to be placed upon some items of language in the bill. As I said a moment ago to the Senator from Florida, I did have communications from responsible people who had been before our committee. If the Senator will give me his very close consideration and attention for a moment, I wish to read a portion of a letter from the director of the School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, one of the witnesses before the working committee. I quote from the letter:

As pointed out in an earlier letter to you, section 372 (B) (4) states on page 39, line 4, that grants will be given to "each school of public health which provides training leading to a graduate degree in fields relating to public health." A similar provision appears in lines 7 and 8 of page 38 granting aid to schools of nursing. In my earlier letter I pointed out that of the 10 universities having programs leading to a master's degree, and accredited for such by the American Public Health Association, 8 operated schools of public health, whereas in 2, namely, Yale and Tulane, the program is in a department of preventative medicine and public health of the medical school. Similarly, many of the 31 universities accredited for programs in public health nursing, have their program in some part of the university other than the school of nursing. At Minnesota this is in the school of public health, but at the undergraduate level. In Columbia it is within Teachers College, which is the college of education. I have feared that an overstrict, legalistic interpretation of these two sections might cheat certain universities out of funds unless they were to rearrange their internal organization, so that such programs would be under schools of public health or schools of nursing, respectively.

Obviously, it is not the intent of the bill to prescribe to a university the details of its internal organization. When I discussed this with the working committee, there was agreement as to the intent of the bill and the suggestion was made by the committee that an extra paragraph be inserted which would make it clear that wherever the terms "school of public health," "school of nursing," "school of medicine," etc., were used, they would refer to that portion of a university however named which carried on the type of accredited program referred to in the respective paragraph. On careful examination of the bill I find no such defining clause.

I hope that I am unnecessarily apprehensive and that the clear intent of the bill would outweigh the actual phraseology. Unfortunately I have had enough experience

with overstrict legal interpretations that I am still apprehensive lest someone stick to the wording rather than the intent, and certain universities, including the University of Minnesota, be cheated out of funds to which they would otherwise be entitled.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has given the bill such splendid leadership and guidance, whether or not the intent of the bill as it is interpreted here by the director of the School of Public Health of the University of Minnesota, Dr. Gaylord W. Anderson, is not that the manner in which the funds are to be distributed by the Surgeon General. Is not that the spirit of the law as well as the letter of the law shall be followed? Would the Senator concur in Dr. Anderson's interpretation?

Mr. PEPPER. My answer to that would be "Yes," and to buttress it with another homely expression, we look at the substance and not the form. The curriculum is the important thing, not whether a particular course happens to be followed in one building or another, in one school or another, nursing school, or other school, referring to that portion of an institution, without name, which carries on the type of accredited program referred to in the respective provisions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would be true of the school of public health, too.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. What we are talking about is the training that leads to a degree by an approved school in the named categories; a curriculum, that leads to a degree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have printed at this point in the Record the two letters I mentioned a moment ago, rather than to have them appear in the Record previously. They should follow the colloquy we have just had.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters referred to by the Senator from Minnesota be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,  
THE MEDICAL SCHOOL,  
Minneapolis, August 18, 1949.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This letter is written to you in my dual capacity as Director of the School of Public Health at Minnesota and as secretary of the Association of Schools of Public Health. In both capacities I have been much pleased with and deeply appreciate the active interest you have taken in the bill for aid to education in the health sciences, which currently appears as S. 1453.

The current bill impresses me as excellent, but I have one very minor reservation. As pointed out in an earlier letter to you, section 372 (B) (4) states on page 39, line 4, that grants will be given to "each school of public health which provides training leading to a graduate degree in fields relating to public health." A similar provision appears in lines 7 and 8 of page 38 granting aid to schools of nursing. In my earlier letter I pointed out that of the 10 universities having programs leading to a master's degree, and accredited for such by the American Public Health Association, 8 operated schools of public health, whereas in 2, namely, Yale and Tulane, the program is in a department of preventive medicine and public health of

the medical school. Similarly, many of the 31 universities accredited for programs in public health nursing have their program in some part of the university other than the school of nursing. At Minnesota this is in the School of Public Health, but at the undergraduate level. In Columbia it is within Teachers College, which is the College of Education. I have feared that an overstrict legalistic interpretation of these two sections might cheat certain universities out of funds unless they were to rearrange their internal organization, so that such programs would be under schools of public health or schools of nursing, respectively.

Obviously, it is not the intent of the bill to prescribe to a university the details of its internal organization. When I discussed this with the working committee, there was agreement as to the intent of the bill and the suggestion was made by the committee that an extra paragraph be inserted which would make it clear that wherever the terms "school of public health," "school of nursing," "school of medicine," etc., were used, they would refer to that portion of a university, however named, which carried on the type of accredited program referred to in the respective paragraph. On careful examination of the bill I find no such defining clause.

I hope that I am unnecessarily apprehensive and that the clear intent of the bill would outweigh the actual phraseology. Unfortunately I have had enough experience with overstrict legal interpretations that I am still apprehensive lest someone stick to the wording rather than the intent and certain universities, including the University of Minnesota, be cheated out of funds to which they would otherwise be entitled.

I sincerely hope that this bill will come up for action by the Senate during the current session and that at that time this defect may be corrected if, in the eyes of the legal counsel of the Senate, such correction is necessary to accomplish the purpose of the bill. May I assure you of my sincere appreciation and the appreciation of the Association of Schools of Public Health for the interest you have taken in this bill.

Very truly yours,  
GAYLORD W. ANDERSON, M. D.,  
Mayo Professor and Director,  
School of Public Health.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,  
Minneapolis, Minn., August 30, 1949.  
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have been watching with very real interest the progress that is being made in the Senate with reference to aid to schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and public health, and have been much pleased with the active support you are giving to this bill. While the present draft reported by the Committee on Labor contains certain elements which I wish were not in it, on the whole I believe it is a very forward step and one of very great potential benefit to the University of Minnesota. I sincerely hope, therefore, that you will be successful in obtaining favorable action on this bill.

There is one aspect of the bill, however, which seems to me to be open to possible misunderstanding; namely, the definition of a school of nursing or a school of public health. It is the obvious intent of the bill that aid shall be given to all institutions carrying on accredited programs in the several fields covered by this legislation. On the other hand, the wording of paragraphs 372 B3 and B4 making specific reference to grants to university-controlled or college-controlled schools of nursing and to schools of public health, respectively, might be interpreted as excluding grants to a university carrying on perfectly satisfactory training programs through parts of the university other than a school of nursing or a school of public health.



For example, at the University of Minnesota, basic nursing is in the school of nursing but public-health nursing is in the school of public health. The majority of the latter students are working for a bachelor's degree, so would not count under the per student grant to schools of public health since this grant is specifically couched in terms of graduate training. Similarly, these students would not count under the nursing provision inasmuch as they are not registered in the school of nursing. During the fall quarter of 1948, 171 such students in public-health nursing were enrolled in the school of public health at Minnesota. Under the obvious intent of the bill, the university would be eligible to receive some \$34,000 for these students on the basis of this enrollment but might be cheated out of this because of our form of organization which carried such work as an undergraduate activity of the school of public health. Columbia University would be similarly affected as it carries its public-health-nursing program under teachers' college.

I feel confident that it is not the intent of the bill to deprive universities of merited support because of their form of internal organization, and equally that it is not the intent of the bill that the Federal Government shall compel universities to change their internal form of organization simply to become eligible for grants of this character. It may be that I am unduly apprehensive as to the interpretation that would be put on the bill, but I do feel that it would be desirable to avoid possible misunderstanding through a clarification at this time. I believe such clarification could be achieved by an extra statement somewhere in the bill to the effect that wherever the term "school of medicine," "school of dentistry," "school of nursing," or "school of public health" is used in this bill, it will refer to whatever portion of the university is carrying on a suitably accredited program regardless of designation of the unit. I believe that an amendment of this sort would avoid all possible misunderstanding.

May I assure you of the university's appreciation for the interest you are taking in this bill, and express the hope that it will be acted upon favorably by the Senate.

Respectfully,

J. L. MORRILL, *President*.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that concludes the explanation I wish to make. I hope the Senate will pass the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill, on page 42, in line 6, after the word "osteopathic," to insert the word "chiropractic," and at such other places in the bill where the word "osteopathic" occurs. I do this not to delay passage of this important legislation, because I am wholeheartedly in favor of it, as I told the Senator from Florida on the floor. Had the osteopathic institutions not been included, there might have been some merit in leaving out the chiropractic schools. But so long as we have gone into another allied field of healing science, namely, osteopathy, I must say that the situation which prevails respecting osteopathy prevails with respect to chiropractic.

The Senator from Ohio asked me how many profit schools would be involved. The truth is that in both these allied fields of healing science some of the schools are profit schools and some are nonprofit. But, of course, under the provisions of the bill, whether the school be a school of osteopathy or a school of chiropractic, it could be aided only in the event it was a nonprofit school. The

bill is limited to nonprofit schools, so those who teach these two healing sciences for profit would not be recipients of the benefits provided by the bill. For that reason I offer the amendment. Had the one not been included in the bill, there might have been some reason to keep them both out, but I cannot see any reason for discriminating between the two healing sciences in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1453) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes."

#### EDUCATION OR TRAINING OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to education or training of certain veterans.

During the last week my attention has been called to what I believe to be two or three extremely arbitrary regulations issued by the Veterans' Administration with relation to trade schools. Those regulations are seriously inconveniencing thousands of veterans. I think they are not in accord with the general terms of the general appropriation bill or the rider to which the Senate agreed voluntarily. I am introducing the bill to correct the present interpretation of the Veterans' Administration of that bill, and other legislation.

I have prepared the bill rather hastily. I am quite willing to modify some parts of it, but I think it is important that Congress act at once on some such bill. I, therefore, introduce the bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Ohio has introduced the bill, because in my State there are a couple of schools which students are now ready to enter, and have heretofore been students under legislation passed by the Federal Government, but through regulation and interpretations made by the Veterans' Administration many hundreds and perhaps many thousands of such students who have been relying upon the Federal law to take care of them in their school work this year, will be thrown out of school. I sincerely hope the committee will act upon the bill with all convenient speed and report it to the Senate, because students are now ready to go to these schools; yet the Veterans' Administration is holding them out because the schools are not on the accredited list, or

because some particular organization is complaining that a school does not have the qualifications and the necessary background and so forth. Yet such schools have been operating in my State heretofore. I have not been able to do anything to convince the Veterans' Administration that there is a serious injustice being done these students.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), introduced by Mr. TAFT, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Robert L. Stenborg and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have a few remarks I wish to make on another matter. I should like to make those remarks before the Senate proceeds with executive business.

Mr. LUCAS. I should be glad to move that the Senate reconsider my previous motion if the Senator desires to speak now.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are two routine nominations which appear on the back of the Executive Calendar. The two are collectors of customs. I wonder if we could not have them confirmed before the Senator proceeds to make his statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, my statement will require only 2 or 3 minutes to make.

Mr. HILL. The nominations are routine. If the nominations may be stated we can act upon them quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The Chair will state that it does not matter whether the Senate is in executive session or not; the Senator from Washington would still be able to make his statement.

Mr. HILL. Certainly. I appreciate that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that when two Senators from Alabama are interested in an executive nomination from their State, one being in the chair and the other on the floor, I do not have much choice in this matter. [Laughter.] So long as one of the men nominated to

be collector of customs comes from Alabama I appreciate my situation, and I subside momentarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

#### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph H. Lyons, of Mobile, Ala., to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wesley R. Wirtz, of Baton Rouge, La., to be collector of customs, customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection the President will be notified of both confirmations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that the senior Senator from Alabama asked for the confirmation of Mr. Lyons before the junior Senator, who occupies the chair, "confirmed him."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would not the Senator also have the RECORD show that Mr. Lyons is from Alabama?

Mr. LUCAS. There is no doubt about that. I heard the two Senators from Alabama collaborating upon the nomination of this gentleman and moving my good friend, the Senator from Washington, to the rear.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

#### COLUMBIA RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senate Public Works Committee now has under consideration a very important rivers and harbors bill, including very vital projects for authorization throughout the entire country. Before the committee is a proposal in the form of a bill—but it can be treated in the nature of an amendment—which includes a great number of projects in the Columbia Basin.

The people of the Pacific Northwest are vitally interested in all phases of Columbia River development. Anything affecting the development of that great river, its tributaries, and related resources affects their lives and their fortunes.

On the Federal level, the Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Agriculture and about eighteen other agencies have resource responsibilities in the Basin. These responsibilities are shared in many ways with State and local government and private organizations.

For many years the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers have been operating in the basin. They have built great dams and irrigation projects. On April 11, this year, they signed an agreement which in effect set up spheres of jurisdiction over the river and its tributaries. In May and June, respectively, they completed and submitted coordinated reports to the Bureau of the Budget. This action was in conformity

with Presidential instruction issued in July 1948. Local interests have been almost unanimous in approving this so-called accord between these two departments as to the structures to be built on the great Columbia River and its tributaries.

The Public Works Committee now has before it several proposals which, if enacted, would authorize a part or all of the program embraced by the coordinated Bureau-Corps reports. One of these proposals is a bill S. 1595, introduced by the junior Senator from Washington. Another is S. 2180, sponsored by myself and other Senators. A third is what we might call a committee amendment to the rivers, harbors, and flood-control bill.

This amendment has been developed over the last 4 or 5 weeks through a series of conferences between my office, staff members of Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, executive department members, and representatives of a number of private organizations from the Columbia Basin, as well as State and local officials. I am certain that other Senators from basin States have been consulted in this process.

This amendment is a modified version of bills before the committee. It proposes to authorize some 40 projects in the Columbia Basin—projects included in the so-called initial phase of the Bureau-Corps reports. In addition it establishes a Columbia Basin account. Appropriate construction costs, allocated for repayment from power revenues, would be charged to this account. Net power revenues would be credited. Any balances on the credit side would be available for assistance to irrigation projects subsequently approved by the Congress. Under this amendment existing flood-control, reclamation, and Bonneville laws would remain unchanged.

Since early July I have been working to achieve, at this session, authorization of the maximum number of projects possible, in the Columbia Basin. Many conflicting interests have come to light in the process, both in and out of Congress. I believe the amendment I have referred to resolves as many of those conflicts as can be resolved and still leave the basic blueprint for long-range Columbia Basin development. Such a blueprint is essential and will in no way jeopardize subsequent enactment of legislation creating a Columbia Valley Administration.

In order that our efforts on this great project may be a matter of record, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks: a letter addressed to the chairman of the Public Works Committee on July 8, signed by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and myself; also a letter I sent to the subcommittee chairman on August 30; the draft of the amendment now under consideration by the Public Works Committee, which is substantially the same amendment I transmitted with my August 30 letter,

and an editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of September 17, 1949, parts of which I agree with and parts of which I disagree with. Surely much of the confusion stems from a misunderstanding as to the purposes of the amendment.

Also I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I issued today to the newspapers and the public in my area, in an effort not only to clear up what our efforts have been before the Public Works Committee now considering the matter, but to clear up any misunderstanding as to the intent and purposes of the proposals before the committee.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND  
FOREIGN COMMERCE,  
July 8, 1949.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,  
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Your statement of July 7 announced your intention of initiating hearings on July 12 of the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control bill, H. R. 5472, as reported by the House Public Works Committee on July 6.

There is one matter which appropriately could not be included in the House bill, but which has now progressed to the point where it can be considered by your committee. We refer to authorization of the so-called Bureau of Reclamation-Army engineers' coordinated plan for structures in the Columbia Basin and certain contiguous areas. Throughout these hearings your committee correctly differentiated between these proposals and CVA bills. The CVA proposal is primarily concerned with the administration or managerial phase of the problem; the reports of the two Departments place primary emphasis on structures required for the physical development of the area.

Secretary Krug, who spoke for the executive branch of the Government on CVA, recognized this differentiation in his testimony before your committee. He recommended that authorizations included in the two reports proceed promptly so that needed physical developments may not be delayed while the managerial question is under consideration and awaiting final decision.

Testimony by State and Federal officials and by other prominent individuals before your committee and before the House Public Works Committee has been unanimous in support of prompt authorization of the Army and Interior plan. Witnesses have expressed this view freely regardless of their views on the management question.

Two bills now before the Senate are designed to accomplish the authorization of the Interior-Army integrated plan and agreement previously referred to—S. 2180, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON and S. 1595 by Senator CAIN. We respectfully request that your committee give prompt and favorable consideration to adoption of appropriate amendment to H. R. 5472, which will carry out the identical purposes of these bills.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
United States Senator.  
BERT MILLER,  
United States Senator.  
GLEN TAYLOR,  
United States Senator.  
WAYNE MORSE,  
United States Senator.  
GUY CORDON,  
United States Senator.



UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE  
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,  
August 30, 1949.

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rivers and  
Harbors, Committee on Public Works,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: The rivers and harbors bill, as passed by the House contains on page 24 a section authorizing construction of a dam at Albeni Falls. Attached is an amendment to that section which I would like the subcommittee to consider in the event you do not act favorably on the request contained in the second paragraph of this letter.

Some time ago other Northwest Senators and I addressed a letter to Senator CHAVEZ, urging that an appropriate amendment to the rivers and harbors bill be devised, authorizing projects included in exhibit F of the integrated corps report on the Columbia Basin. Earlier I introduced a bill, S. 2180, and Senator CAIN introduced S. 1595, aimed at accomplishing this objective.

Since introduction of S. 2180, numerous conferences have been held with organizations and individuals vitally interested in basin development. The consensus is that authorizing language along lines of the attached amendment would avoid some of the substantive questions involved in S. 2180 as originally drawn.

I, therefore, urge your subcommittee adopt the enclosed language as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. If any questions arise in this regard while the committee is marking up the bill, I will deeply appreciate an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee in an effort to reach a workable solution.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
United States Senator.

DRAFT OF AMENDMENT PROPOSED TO BE MADE  
TO H. R. 5472

SEC. —. (a) That for the purposes of improving navigation, controlling floods, and conserving and utilizing the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries for the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands and the generation of hydroelectric power, and for incidental purposes, the physical plan for comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin reflected in the report of May 2, 1949, by the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the report of June 28, 1949, by the Chief of Engineers entitled "Columbia River and Tributaries, Northwestern United States," all as coordinated by agreement of April 11, 1949, entered into by the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior, on the one hand, and the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, on the other, is hereby approved and construction of the projects, works, and improvements comprehended within the initial stages therein recommended is hereby authorized to be prosecuted respectively by the Department of the Interior under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior and by the Chief of Engineers under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army in accordance with the statement of the responsibilities of said agencies denominated Exhibit F and attached to the Digest Agreement on Principles and Responsibilities, Columbia River Basin, enclosed with the letter of April 11, 1949, addressed to the President by the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior, the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of the Army.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall establish a Columbia Basin Account which shall be credited with all net power revenues received from Federal power plants and

transmission lines and facilities existing, herein and heretofore authorized, and upon authorization, from such plants, lines, and facilities as may be authorized hereafter by act of Congress, within the Pacific Northwest as that area is defined in paragraph 3 (2) of the recommendations contained in said report of May 2, 1949. Said account shall be charged with all reimbursable construction costs allocated to power and all other reimbursable construction costs assigned for return from power revenues in connection with all projects existing, herein, and heretofore authorized, and, upon authorization, such projects as may be authorized hereafter by act of Congress, within said Pacific Northwest. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress annually on the status of said account, as of the close of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1951. Costs and revenues charged and credited to said account, together with estimated costs and revenues, shall be taken into account in fixing rates for the sale of power and energy from Federal projects in said Pacific Northwest. Said rates shall be sufficient to return within a reasonable period of years the costs stated in recommendations numbered 8 (2) (a) and (b) in said report of May 2, 1949, taking into account the application of interest on the power investment to the return of nonpower costs: *Provided*, That said interest shall be at rates not less than those specified in existing applicable laws and not less than 2 percent per annum on any power investment for which existing laws do not specify a minimum rate. Otherwise, nothing in this section shall be construed as repealing, modifying, or affecting in any way the Federal reclamation laws, the act of August 20, 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended, the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 88), or the act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 22), with respect to returns, the deposit of revenues, or the marketing and disposition of power and energy.

(c) Subject to this section and to his area-wide findings regarding the benefits, the allocations of construction and maintenance costs and the repayments by water users, the Secretary of the Interior shall in the prosecution of his activities under this section be governed by the Federal reclamation laws. The Secretary of the Army in prosecuting his activities under this section shall be governed by the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and the control of floods.

(d) Projects not specifically herein authorized in the initial stages of the comprehensive plans shall be submitted to the Congress in conformity with the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the partial accomplishment of the projects, works, and improvements herein authorized: to the Department of the Interior, \$500,000,000; and to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, \$500,000,000.

(f) The use of waters, in connection with the operation and maintenance of Federal dams and other works in the Columbia River and its tributaries, shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in the States drained by said river and its tributaries of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to projects of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or to supersede existing provisions of law relating to the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife.

[From the Oregon Daily Journal of September 17, 1949]

#### THE CVA GAMBLE

For months, administration representatives who favor a Columbia Valley Administration have delayed and obstructed the regular rivers and harbors appropriation bill and two companion measures (introduced by Senators MAGNUSON and CAIN, of Washington) authorizing the consolidated \$3,000,000,000 program of the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation for the orderly development of the Columbia Basin.

These forces which have been working quietly behind the scenes have finally come out into the open. They have laid their cards on the table. They have publicly requested, through a letter to the Senate Public Works Committee by William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, that action on the coordinated program be sidetracked in favor of the administration's highly controversial CVA bill.

Warne says President Truman "believes it would be a mistake to include the substance of S. 2180 (the Magnuson version) in the Rivers and Harbors Flood Control bill at this time." He asked for time to make an "executive review."

This is one of the most bizarre deals in the history of Washington politics. First of all, administration forces have delayed the \$1,300,000,000 rivers and harbors bill in various ways for 2 months, while they tried to jockey pet bills, including CVA, through the Congress. Finally the House Public Works Committee reported it out in August, but the Rules Committee held it up 21 days, the limit, before it went to the floor of the House for overwhelming approval. Then it went to the Senate, where MAGNUSON and CAIN are seeking to attach their amendment which would give congressional approval to the consolidated river development program to be carried out by existing agencies. One of its features is a Columbia Basin account to be expended at the direction of the Congress and into which power revenues for liquidation of various projects would be placed.

Meanwhile the Bureau of the Budget, apparently at the direction of the President, notified the Senate Public Works Committee that it had the consolidated development bill but asked the committee not to consider it at this time.

Apparently fearing that this bill would win Senate approval, and once approved, might work, thus obviating CVA, the President, through Warne, again took a hand, asking further time for Executive review.

This is indeed a strange request. The President himself directed the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to consolidate the Army's 308 report for development of Columbia Basin with the Bureau's comprehensive program. This they did last April, the formal agreement being approved by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation, and others at interest.

Furthermore the Magnuson and Cain bills also have been consolidated and simplified and have the approval of reclamation and power interests.

One can only conclude that administration proponents of CVA which, incidentally, doesn't have a chance of approval at this session of the Congress, simply decided that the consolidated Army-Bureau program for development of the Columbia River (which they had previously approved) didn't fit into the CVA pattern. Hence their obstruction of both the rivers and harbors bill and the consolidated basin development program which, incidentally, has the approval of both Senators CORDON and MONSE of Oregon.

What this means, of course, is that the CVA clique in the administration and in the

Congress is willing to delay and gamble with the orderly development of the entire Columbia Basin in their attempt to jam through their valley authority proposal. They are willing to gamble on the serious power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. They are willing to gamble on disastrous flood and to imperil reclamation projects.

This is politics at its worst.

**STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON ON PROJECTS IN THE COMPREHENSIVE COLUMBIA BASIN PLAN**

In order to correct certain misunderstandings I want to make it clear that I am vigorously in favor of obtaining authorization for as many of the projects in the so-called coordinated plan for development of the Columbia Basin as it is possible to get.

This is in reference to the coordinated reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers on development of the Columbia River Basin. I intend to make an appearance before the Senate Public Works Committee next week, and at that time I shall urge that every project which the committee deems it advisable to authorize, be authorized.

Disturbing reports are being circulated to the effect that delay in authorizing these projects is for the purpose of putting the proposed Columbia Valley Administration in first place; and on the other hand that authorization of the 308 report will hamper progress on the proposed CVA. Neither is true, in my opinion. The coordinated plan represents one question; the question of construction. The Columbia Valley Administration involves another question; the question of management. I have introduced legislation calling for both. We intend to hold early hearings in the area concerned on the CVA proposals, at which time all the arguments can be heard.

As for the coordinated plan the Budget Bureau has had the reports before it since last July, and in my judgment, has had sufficient time to act upon them. The projects need authorization. I am conferring with Senator CHAVEZ, Senator CAIN, and other members of the committee, to that end.

**THE ARMY AIR FORCE**

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words this afternoon in connection with the announcement concerning the development of atomic energy, which has been made today. For many years I have supported the 70-group air force. I was one of the few members of the Armed Services Committee who voted this year to maintain the Air Force and to retain for the Air Force the \$800,000,000 of universal military training money which was allowed it by the House of Representatives, but which was eliminated by the Senate. The bill is still before the conference, and I hope that every consideration will be given by the conferees on the part of the Senate and conferees on the part of the House to retaining as much money as possible for the Army Air Force.

I realize that I am not a strategist. I deeply appreciate and acknowledge the important work which the Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson has done, having spoken in the past on the subject and having been one of the few Members of the Senate who supported the appropriation for the Army Air Force this year. I want the RECORD to show that I trust that the Air Force will not be neglected in the conference. I hope that the \$800,000,000 which was taken away from it, which the House transferred from

universal military training, will be retained for the Army Air Force, as our first line of offense and defense.

**THE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING ATOMIC ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IN RUSSIA**

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement relative to the announcement by the President today. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, indicated that he had been called to the White House yesterday afternoon at 3:30. Upon inquiry I find that the office of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] was telephoned about 11 o'clock, or perhaps 11:06 yesterday morning, and he was also invited to the meeting at the White House, to be held at 3:30 yesterday afternoon. The Senator from Iowa is out of the city. His office notified the White House that he could not be present at the meeting on such short notice.

In view of the fact that the White House was notified at 11:06 that the Senator from Iowa could not be present, I think it is somewhat regrettable that there could not have been conformity with the general bipartisan policy on a matter of this importance. I think it is to be regretted that the next senior ranking Republican on the joint committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], was not invited; or, in the event he could not be present, the next ranking Republican Senator, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], should have been asked to attend a meeting of that importance. The fourth and most junior Republican member of the joint committee is the junior Senator from California.

I merely mention this because, in the event that other matters of such widespread importance are before the country, the Congress, and the executive branch of the Government, it seems to me that in the absence of the ranking Republican, the next ranking Republican member should be invited, so that the bipartisan policy may be carried out in full.

**NOMINATION OF WILLIAM E. KRENNING TO BE POSTMASTER AT SAN DIEGO, CALIF.**

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate now proceed to consider the nomination of William E. Krenning to be postmaster at San Diego, Calif. The nomination appears upon the Executive Calendar. It has heretofore been held up by the objection of the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. In view of the unanimous approval of the appropriate committee, I shall rest upon that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in executive session. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I merely wish to point out that I raised no objection regarding Mr. Krenning's competence or capability. My point goes entirely to the question whether or not the civil-service

laws enacted by the Congress are being followed by the administrative agencies. I think it is a matter of general public policy about which the Senate should fully inform itself.

Under date of June 24, 1949, I addressed a letter to the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, reading as follows:

JUNE 24, 1949.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Post  
Office and Civil Service,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On June 13, 1949, I contacted you regarding the nominations of California postmasters and at that time requested that you withhold action on the nomination of Mr. William E. Krenning as postmaster at San Diego. Since that time I have had correspondence with the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department and, for your information, I am enclosing copies of this correspondence.

As a result of a civil-service examination held, presumably in 1948, the Civil Service Commission certified on June 3, 1948, the names of Mr. Joseph F. Silvers and Mr. William E. Krenning. Appeals were received from applicants who took the examination and had been rated ineligible. As a result of an investigation the Commission found that two of the applicants were entitled to military preference and, subsequently, were certified to the Post Office Department on April 26, 1949. As a result of this action the eligible roster for appointment as postmaster at San Diego should consist of:

	Percent
Joseph F. Silvers.....	79.60
Donald E. Bates.....	78.20
Lester J. Wadsworth.....	77.00

Notwithstanding the "choice of three" civil-service regulation, on May 16, 1949, the name of Mr. William E. Krenning was submitted to become postmaster at San Diego.

From the facts that have been made available to me it seems as though an irregularity has been permitted in the selection, since Mr. Krenning was not one of the three on the register and the two veterans were completely disregarded in making the appointment.

It would be appreciated if your committee could look into the case in order to determine whether the appointment was or was not made in accordance with civil-service regulations.

With best regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

I have a letter dated June 13, 1949, from the United States Civil Service Commission, addressed to me, reading as follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL  
SERVICE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., June 13, 1949.  
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Supplementing my letter of June 9, you are informed that on June 3, 1948, we certified the names of two eligibles from the register for first-class postmaster at San Diego, Calif. These eligibles were Joseph F. Silvers and William E. Krenning. As a result of reinvestigation and review, from which we obtained two additional eligibles, the Commission issued a second certificate on April 26, 1949, which contained the names of Joseph F. Silvers, Donald E. Bates, and Lester J. Wadsworth.

As I informed you in my previous letter, the name of Mr. Krenning, who was selected at the time the register consisted of only



two names, has been resubmitted for confirmation by the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WM. C. HULL,  
Executive Assistant.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I hold in my hand the nomination reference and report which sent to the Senate the name of Mr. William E. Krenning, of San Diego, Calif. It is dated May 16, 1949, which was subsequent to the time when the Civil Service Commission had certified the names of three other persons, Mr. Krenning's name being the fourth one.

Mr. President, let me point out that I merely want my able colleagues on the other side of the aisle to realize in what way the law is being violated, in my opinion, both in letter and in spirit, and the precedent they are establishing by so doing.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me read from the official document, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., information regarding postmaster positions filled through nomination by the President for confirmation by the Senate.

I read from page 7:

In filling a vacancy by means of open competitive examination the names of the highest three eligibles resulting therefrom, if the register contains as many as three, are certified. Any one of these three may be selected by the appointing officer. Certification is made without regard to sex unless the Post Office Department specifies sex in its request for certification. The period of eligibility on any register is 1 year from the date of entering the names on the register. The period of eligibility may be extended if it appears that the interests of the service demand such action with respect to the entire register.

I submit, as point No. 1, that Mr. Krenning, able gentleman though he may be, was not one of the top three on the civil-service examination.

I continue to read from this official document:

The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 provides that an appointing officer who passes over a veteran eligible and selects a nonveteran for appointment shall file with the Civil Service Commission his reasons in writing for so doing, under the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Commission shall determine the sufficiency of the reasons submitted. If the reasons given for passing over an eligible veteran and selecting a nonveteran in any given case do not appear sufficient, the Commission is authorized to transmit its findings as to the insufficiency of the reasons to the appointing officer for his consideration, and to send a copy thereof to the veteran eligible or to his designated representative, upon request. This act did not confer upon the Commission any authority to require the appointing officer to take any action toward changing his selection, after consideration of the Commission's findings, so long as it was made in accordance with the civil-service rules.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I submit that in this case, two World War veterans were passed over. No reasons were given for passing them over. Not only were they passed over—which might happen in some cases if a third man on the list had been taken—but in this case someone who was not eligible, in my judgment, under the rule of three, was selected.

Of course, Mr. President, at this late hour I do not intend to ask for a quorum. I realize that with the majority party controlling the proceedings in this Chamber, it would be rather a futile gesture to attempt to force this issue by calling the full Senate together. But I wish to point out that a precedent is being established here, both by violating the rule of three and also by violating the Veterans' Preference Act. I believe that precedent is not good for the civil-service laws of the country. I hope that if in the future my party obtains power in the executive branch of the Government, we shall abide by the letter and the spirit of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in this case, two lists of eligibles were submitted by the Civil Service Commission to the Post Office Department. The first list of eligibles undoubtedly entitled the Post Office to appoint Mr. Krenning. As I recall—and I wish the Senator to correct me if I am in error—the Post Office Department did submit, on the first list, the name of Mr. Krenning to the Senate; but the Senate failed to act by way of confirmation.

Thereafter, the Civil Service Commission of its own volition prepared a second list, but the Post Office Department claimed it had jurisdiction again to present the name of Mr. Krenning upon the first list. The Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission procured the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Justice, calling for the opinion of the Department of Justice as to whether the Post Office Department acted properly in renewing its nomination of Mr. Krenning, upon the first list, even though a second list had been made. The Department of Justice gave an opinion stating that in its opinion the action of the Post Office Department was legal. The opinion was read before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. There was a careful presentation of all the facts in the committee hearings, at which my eloquent colleague appeared, and I believe it is by unanimous vote of the committee that the nomination is now before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator has stated additional information which it is well to have in the RECORD. I want to say, however, that the point whereon the junior Senator from California disagrees with the Civil Service Commission and the appointing authority, the Post Office Department, is that on the original list the reason Mr. Krenning's name appeared was because the law was not followed, and two men with veterans' preference did not get the credits to which they were entitled. As the result of complaint being made, followed by a reinvestigation, a new list was compiled which showed that Mr. Krenning was fourth on the list, with two veterans having been passed over. I think that is what the record shows.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in fairness to my colleague, who is always ultra fair himself, it appeared, for some reason which was never developed, that the two

veterans were not given their proper points and were not properly certified by the Civil Service Commission. But there was no question of fraud raised. No question was raised about the list at that time. The Post Office Department acted, I believe, in the utmost good faith in presenting Mr. Krenning's name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

#### TRIBUTE TO MARINE CORPS RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of Senators a brief tribute to the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, together with a fact sheet giving a thumbnail sketch of the accomplishments of that organization.

There being no objection, the statement and accompanying paper were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute here today briefly to the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, and to its national president, Col. Melvin J. Maas, for many years a distinguished member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and a pioneer aviator.

Many organizations with which we must deal here in the Congress of the United States serve various special interests, and their officers are highly salaried. Not only do the officers of MCROA not receive any salaries but they serve no special interests other than those of the Marine Corps and national defense. This particular type of special interest is for the benefit of all citizens.

Like many organizations today, MCROA has drawn up a platform of its objectives and its accomplishments, both of which are outstanding. Many Members of the Congress have frequently relied upon the recommendations, advice, and suggestions volunteered by MCROA representatives either in person or before the committees of Congress.

Because of its record since 1926, when it was formed, a record which brings us to the present and its endorsement of our bill, Senate 2177, to provide for a minimum flooring on Marine personnel strength, I feel marines everywhere and also those citizens interested in the Nation's defense, should know more about this small professional guild of civilian reserve officers.

I am glad to supplement these remarks with a brief fact sheet titled "A Word About MCROA" so that all may see what good can be accomplished by other organizations interested in the Nation's welfare, either working alone or in cooperation with other groups.

#### A WORD ABOUT THE MARINE CORPS RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

A professional guild of Marine Corps Reserve Officers, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, was organized in 1926 and has existed through the years to promote the best interest of the corps, the country, and the Reserves. The original objectives still guide the present officers of the national council, the officers of some 45 local chapters and the board of directors from each of the Marine Reserve districts. They are:

To foster the advancement of the professional and technical skills of Reserve officers.

To promote the interest of Reserve officers in the Marine Corps and the interest of the Marine Corps in its Reserve officers.

To speak for Reserve officers before the committees of Congress on matters affecting the corps, particularly in relation to personnel legislation.

To represent and assist individual members at Marine Corps headquarters; and, at all times—

To promote the interests of the Marine Corps to the end that it may best advance the welfare and serve the security of the United States.

In the past when the Reserve program was in its infancy, MCROA—

Induced the corps to prepare a Reserve training program.

Obtained from Congress sufficient funds for training.

Increased training funds by yearly pleas to Congress.

Succeeded in having standards adopted for Reserve commissions.

Fought for and got wartime disability retirement for Reserves.

Managed, in time, to insist upon and get a uniform promotion system.

Initiated, sponsored, and obtained passage of a new basic Reserve law.

In the present, MCROA has continued liaison with HQMC and also—

Called for interservice cooperation and understanding, first among the Reserve associations, at its January 29, 1949, national conference in Chicago.

Continued its fight of 1932 against the enemies of the corps in helping beat down the original form of the Unification Act, subsequently amended.

Triumphed in its demands that consolidation directive No. 1, the Reserve "gag rule," be rescinded by the Department of Defense.

Succeeded in having its voice heard in Congress in recent efforts to amend the Tydings bill and have adequate safeguards given the corps.

Publicized and backed the slogan "6 percent for security," and worked closely with 55 Representatives and 4 Senators in having bills introduced to assure the corps of always having a minimum of 6 percent of total armed force personnel strength.

Arranged to have the two flag raising portrayed in the Inauguration Day parade and in other float parades across the country.

Stood alone in resisting "merger" of all reserve officer associations and is today only one standing alone but working cooperatively with ROA.

Successfully persuaded Congress to pass nondisability reserve retirement act after many years of effort, helping sponsor VTU program.

Pointed out to Congress necessity of reserve disability retirement and testified at length on pay bill as it concerned reserves.

Submitted yearly items for Reserve Policy Board agenda, sat on boards.

Intends to see that country does not forget November 10 birthday.

Is sponsoring a new Reserve Act, giving reserves complete parity with regulars.

Continues the fight against any budget cuts in the corps that are considered disproportionate to funds allotted other services, and hopes Marine Reserve officers will help win today's battles by joining.

#### RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, September 26, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 23 (legislative day of September 3), 1949:

##### ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Philippines, to be the representative of the United States of America to the fifth session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

##### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

John C. Pickett, of Wyoming, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, to fill a new position.

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. James V. Allred, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas, to fill a new position.

Ben C. Connally, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas, to fill a new position.

James M. Carter, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, to fill a new position.

Harry C. Westover, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, to fill a new position.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 23 (legislative day of September 3, 1949):

##### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Joseph H. Lyons, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala.

Wesley R. Wirtz, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

##### POSTMASTER CALIFORNIA

William E. Krenning, San Diego.

## SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1949

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 3, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as toils and turmoils testing our jaded spirits wait with each day's duty, we bless Thy name that at noontide stand these gates of peace that open to a holy shrine of prayer. In a world that lieth in darkness, swept by fitful winds of despair and doubt, we pause at this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace to make sure that the light within is not dimmed. In this desperate hour when the world's hope of a bright tomorrow is committed to our frail hands, join us to the great company of unconquered spirits who in evil times have preserved the heritage of man's best and whose flaming faith has made their lives

as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of that One who is the Light of the World. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 23, 1949, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 1746) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co., in Stoughton, Mass.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5895) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. EATON, and Mr. VORYS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Chapman	Kem	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cordon	Knowland	Schoeppel
Donnell	Langer	Smith, Maine
Downey	Leahy	Sparkman
Eaton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Tobey
Gillette	McKellar	Vandenberg
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Gurney	Malone	Wherry
Hayden	Martin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hoey	Millikin	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EAST-